

The Classical Review

MAY 1902.

THE announcement of a proposal to revive the Palaeographical Society will cause pleasurable surprise in many quarters. The old society was founded in 1873 and its career came to a close in 1895; and the present time seems an opportune one for the formation of a new one which will resume the work of its predecessor upon much the same lines. In one respect it will probably be different as it will draw its illustrations less from the stores of the British Museum than from collections abroad and from the libraries of Universities Colleges Cathedrals and private collectors in this country. Promises of adhesion and co-operation have already been received from the custodians of the MSS. in the great libraries in Oxford, Cambridge, and Dublin, Paris, Berlin, Heidelberg, Florence, Milan and Rome. The circular bears the signatures of Sir E. M. Thompson, Mr. G. F. Warner, and Mr. F. G. Kenyon, to any of whom promises of support may be sent. The proposed subscription is one guinea, and as soon as a sufficient number of names have been received, a preliminary meeting will be held.

At the present day there is no need to insist upon the importance of a knowledge of palaeography to every classical scholar; and such knowledge may no doubt be best acquired by a study of originals or facsimiles. There is something however which the palaeographical expert might do to smooth the path of those who have but scanty leisure to examine MSS. for themselves, and which, so far as Latin scholarship is concerned is badly needed at the present time; we mean the collection into one

NO. CXXI. VOL. XVI.

volume of the alphabets and chief siglae current at different periods and in different places. It is no exaggeration to say that there are several Latin authors whose text cannot be placed on a sure foundation until the stages through which it has passed are realised. Suppose, a by no means improbable occurrence, that an archetype in rustic capitals was copied by a Merovingian scribe, and from this copy another made in Caroline minuscule which was in its turn the exemplar of a thirteenth century German scribe whose copy was finally the source of a fifteenth century Italian MS. We should get a text resulting whose corruptions it will be impossible to unravel without a knowledge of all the scripts which had conspired to produce them. We commend the suggestion to the new society.

The discovery of some new fragments of Sappho and Alcaeus published in Bulletin no. X (Sitzungsberichte, February 20) of the Royal Berlin Academy may be news to some of our readers. They formed part of a collection acquired in 1896 through the instrumentality of Dr. Reinhardt; and they were brought to light by Dr. W. Schubart who gives a restoration of them with facsimiles in the above cited bulletin. The Sappho fragments (three in number) are on parchment written in a small and careful uncial, ascribed by the editor to the 6th if not the 7th century A.D. (Mr. Kenyon thinks the later date the nearer). One of the fragments is a mere scrap. The subject of the first of the longer ones is the leave-taking of a young woman who has been a member of the Sapphic circle. She is heart-broken with grief, and Sappho endeavours to

comfort her by reminding her of all the happy times they have had together. The subject of the second is the absence of Atthis, who is mentioned by name. Atthis is in Lydia away from her friends, to one of whom the poem was addressed. The following extract will serve to show the metre of this and the previous poems which appears to be a novel combination.

γῖν δὲ Λύδαισιν ἐνπρέπεται γύναι-
 κέσσιν ὥς ποτ' ἀελίῳ
 δύντος ἅ βροδοδάκτυλος σελάννα
 πάντα περρέχοισ' ἄστρα, φάος δ' ἐπι-
 σχει θάλασσαν ἐπ' ἄλμυράν
 ἴσως καὶ πολυανθέμοις ἀρούραις.

The divisions of the lines are those of the MS., but *σελάννα* is a correction of the editor for *μήνα*. The discovery enables us to place two previously known fragments, Bergk, 46, 49 in their context.

The Alcaeus fragment is on papyrus. It is in uncial writing and appears to be not

later than the 2nd century A.D. It is much mutilated as one line of it which was already known (Fr. 23) will show

[ἄνδρες γὰρ πόλι]ος πύργος ἀρεύ[οι]

We have received from the publishers, the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, the collection of studies with which the former pupils of Professor B. L. Gildersleeve commemorate his seventieth birthday (Oct. 23, 1901). The number of studies is forty-four and the subjects most various. The volume is a handsome and portly one of 527 pages, and is embellished by an agreeable portrait of the Professor who as editor of the *American Journal of Philology*, and in other capacities has done so much for Greek scholarship in America. Its price is six dollars. Apropos of memorial volumes, our readers may be interested to know that Professor van Herwerden, the eminent Greek critic of Holland, is to receive a similar tribute in June upon his retirement from his chair.

THE AXE TEST.

(HOM. *Od.* xix. 572. xxi. 120. 421.)

THE above passages afford one of the most difficult problems in the whole of Homer, *i.e.* what is the precise nature of the test described. The most usual explanation is that axes of a peculiar pattern were used, the heads of which supplied a hole through which an arrow might be shot. There are difficulties in the way of this explanation. It would be hard to discover an axe-head in which there was a hole sufficiently long to allow for the curve described by an arrow in its flight. And if such an axe-head had been used, clearly not being of the usual pattern (the axes that are found in Mycenaean remains being of the simplest description, whether single- or double-headed), its nature would surely have been described so as to clearly describe the test. Moreover if the arrow has to pass through the head of the axe, why is *στειλείη*, which most scholars are agreed in rendering 'handle' introduced so prominently? There is not, however, the slightest hint that any peculiar kind of axe-head is used, we are only told that the axes were arranged in one long trench like *δρύοχοι*. This, apparently, is considered a sufficient explanation of an arrangement so unintelligible to us. If we

regard the axe-handles as being placed upright, as Dr. Monro insists in his *Odyssey*, *δρύοχος* ὡς conveys no more to us than the uprights of a fence or a line of men.

There seems to be a difference of opinion among scholars as to whether *δρύοχοι* were the stays upon which the keel rested while the ribs were being put in, or the ribs themselves. Mr. R. C. Seaton in *Class. Rev.* x. 168b supports the latter view and quotes in favour thereof Procopius (*de bell. Goth.* iv. 22) *τά τε παχέα ξύμπαντα ξύλα ἐς τὴν τρόπιν ἐναρμολθέντα—ἀπερ οἱ μὲν ποιηταὶ δρύοχος καλοῦσιν, ἔτεροι δὲ νομίας—ἐκ τοίχου μὲν ἕκαστον θατέρου ἄχρη ἐς τῆς νεῶς διήκει τὸν ἔτερον τοίχον* and also the schol. on *Ap. Rh.* i. 723. *δρύοχος· ἐν οἷς καταπύσσεται ἡ ἐρῶπις ξύλοις, ταῦτα οὕτως καλοῦσιν* "Ομηρος (τ. 574) *δρύοχοι οἷν τὰ ἐγκοῖλια τῆς νεῶς*. If this view is correct, it seems impossible to understand that the axes were placed straight up. Whether the word *δρύοχοι* was as yet associated with ship-building is not clear in Homer, but it seems unlikely that, if it was originally used to represent upright posts, it should afterwards be transferred to the ribs of a ship.

Now if we take *δρύοχοι* to mean trestles

in the usual acceptance of the term, that is to say, long pieces of wood that cross one another so as to support a log in the angle thus formed, the solution of the problem becomes fairly easy. Such trestles, when required to support a heavy piece of timber, might well have their lower ends buried in the ground for the sake of firmness. It is also probable that trestles when required to hold a log would be so fastened that the parts of the pieces of wood composing them which are above the point of junction would be considerably shorter than the ends below the point of junction. If the axe-handles were crossed in this manner, the lower edges of two axe-heads would enclose the angle

above the point where their two handles intersected, so as to form a rough triangle. The twelve axes may have been arranged in pairs or they may have been placed equidistant from one another. In either case, when seen from one end, a space enclosed on two sides by the axe-handles and on the third side by the axe-heads would run down the line. Thus the axe-handles would play a most important part in the formation of the mark and this would explain the introduction of *στειλαιῆς* in *xxi. 422*. In this arrangement the ordinary axes could be used whether single-headed, or the double-headed *λάβρυν*.

A. T. C. CREE.

APOLLO AND THE ERINYES IN THE *ELECTRA* OF SOPHOCLES.

ONE essential difference in Sophocles' treatment of the Orestes story as compared with that of Aeschylus or Euripides seems so far to have met with no adequate explanation.

I refer to Sophocles' attitude towards the murder of Clytemnestra by Orestes.

Both Aeschylus and Euripides, despite the difference in their standpoint, regard this murder, though expressly commanded by Apollo, as an unnatural crime, exposing Orestes to the pursuit of the Erinyes of his mother. Sophocles on the other hand in his *Electra* treats it as wholly praise-worthy, as the simple discharge of a pious duty, by which means the house of Atreus was freed from its troubles.

This is a difference of conception not easy to account for at a time when Aeschylus' version had become a classic and was sufficiently familiar to an Athenian audience to be burlesqued a few years later by Euripides.

In the introduction to his edition of Sophocles' *Electra* Sir Richard Jebb says (p. xli), 'I do not know any adequate solution of this difficulty, which seems greater than has generally been recognised. I can only suggest one consideration which may help to explain it. The Homeric colouring in the *Electra* is strongly marked; thus the Odyssey is followed in the version of Agamemnon's murder as perpetrated at the banquet,—there are even verbal echoes of it;¹ the chariot race in the *Iliad* (Bk. xxiii) has furnished several traits to the narrative

of the disaster at the Pythian Games.² Sophocles seems to say to his audience 'I give you, modified for drama, the story that Homer tells; put yourselves at the Homeric standpoint: regard the action of Orestes under the light in which the Odyssey presents it.'

To recognise that in this as in other points Sophocles was reverting to the Homeric type is the first step gained: but his motive for doing so is still to seek.

The Choephoroi of Aeschylus turns on a conflict of claims. The murdered Agamemnon is entitled to vengeance at the hand of his son Orestes, and for Orestes to neglect this claim is impious;³ but the murderer of Agamemnon is Orestes' mother, and to shed kindred blood is also impious.⁴ In the one case he has his father's, in the other his mother's Erinyes to fear.⁵ The situation is apparently an impasse. The study of the character of Orestes under the strain of this moral dilemma gives to the play its human interest. But the conflict of human emotions is for Aeschylus second in importance to another. To him Orestes is only the puppet, and the real struggle lies between Apollo and the Erinyes, the contending deities who pull the strings. The question of the origin and development of the Erinyes has been dis-

¹ See on vv. 712, 721 f., 748.

² Aes. Cho. 399-401 and 263-295 for the penalties attending neglect.

³ Aes. Septem vv. 668-9 and Dr. Verrall's note *ad loc.* 721-726, Aes. Cho. 64-63 and Dr. Verrall's note *ad loc.*

⁴ Aes. Cho. 923-4.

⁵ See commentary on v. 95, and on vv. 193-196.

cussed by Miss Jane Harrison in the *Hellenic Journal* for 1899, Pt. II in her suggestive article called *Delphika*, to which I shall repeatedly refer, as it is in her conclusions that I find the basis of my argument. The Erinyes of Aeschylus are variously conceived in the different plays, and indeed in the course of the same play. At times they are, as already in Homer, personified abstractions, but at times they come nearer to the primitive conception of them as the 'angry ghosts' of the dead.¹

In the *Agamemnon*, for example, the Erinyes is an abstraction, a 'detached minister of divine justice'²

ἢ τις Ἀπόλλων
ἢ πᾶν ἢ Ζεὺς . . . ὑστερόποιον
πέμπει παραβάσιν Ἐρινύν.³

or a curse-spirit (*Ag.* 1108) or again the vengeful spirits in particular of injured kin (*Ag.* 1189) *κῶμος . . . συγγόνων Ἐρινύων*. In the *Choephoroi* Aeschylus cites (*Cho.* 282)

προσβολὰς Ἐρινύων
ἐκ τῶν πατρώων αἱμάτων τελούμενας,

('apparitions of fiends brought to effect by that paternal blood,' Dr. Verrall's transl.) as haunting the man who neglects a vengeance claim, a conception not far removed from the primitive one of the 'angry ghost.'⁴ The vengeful spirit of the murdered father is invoked in the *kommos* with elaborate prayer and ritual beside his tomb; and Orestes (symbolised by the snake⁵ of Clytemnestra's dream—another survival of a primitive cult)⁶ is the vehicle of this Erinyes. But, the vengeance effected, he is himself pursued by the Erinyes of his mother,⁷ who in the *Eumenides*⁸ appear as a group of avengers exclusively concerned to avenge the mother-murder.⁹ It is this aspect of them as mother-champions to the exclusion of other claims, such as are for example recognised in the *Choephoroi*, on which Aeschylus fastens to supply the motive in the *Eumenides*: and it is one that truthfully reflects an actual phase in their development.¹⁰

The cult of the Erinyes (early associated

with Gaia the earth mother)¹¹ dates from a time when kinship was traced through the mother, and to shed a mother's blood was the inexpiable sin. They belong then to an older stratum than Apollo, who, as the mouthpiece¹² of his father Zeus, reflects the newer tenet of the greater sanctity of the blood-tie through the father and accordingly in this contention sustains the father's claim.¹³ The opposition is further heightened by the fact that in contrast to the implacability of the Erinyes, who work inexorably as a law of nature,¹⁴ there had arisen with the development of the religion of Delphi a belief in the possibility of purification from guilt through Apollo. On this antithesis between the older and the younger order Aeschylus does not scruple to insist,¹⁵ and in the *Choephoroi* and above all in the *Eumenides* the real point, apart from the political bearing of the play, lies in the struggle between these two powers, the Erinyes and Apollo, and the principles for which they stood.

It is in fact a conflict between two incompatible ideals¹⁶ which were typical of two opposing cults (having their origin we are led to think in racial difference) and we have here reflected a stage in the struggle before the two elements were fused, though their ultimate amalgamation and adaptation is implied in the transformation of the Erinyes into what Miss Harrison would call their 'white'¹⁷ selves under the altered name of *Semnai*.

In the *Choephoroi* Apollo commands Orestes in his dilemma to kill his mother and avenge his father, promising him, as guiltlessly guilty, purification and in the end immunity.

Orestes stakes everything upon Apollo's word: invokes as confederate the vengeful spirit of his father: accomplishes the murder and is at once pursued by the Erinyes of his mother.

¹ *Delphika*, p. 212.

² *Aes. Eum.* 19 *Διὸς προφήτης δ' ἐστὶ Δοξίας πατρός* and *Eum.* 616-18.

³ This transition is curiously illustrated by a passage from the *Septem* where the phraseology of the old belief in the special sanctity of the mother is applied by a transference to the 'father-land.' *Aes. Sep.* 571-3: *μητρός τε πηγὴν τίς κατασβέσει δίκην | πατρὸς δὲ γαῖα σὴς ὑπὸ σπουδῆς δορί | ἀλοῦσα πῶς σοὶ σύμμαχος γενήσεται*; and see Dr. Verrall's note *ad loc.*

⁴ *Aes. Prom.* v. 532 speaks of the *μοῖραι τριμόρφαι μῆμονες τ' Ἐρίνυες* as guiding the helm of necessity and controlling Zeus himself.

⁵ *Aes. Eum.* 150, 162, 394, etc.

⁶ *Delphika*, p. 251.

⁷ *Delphika*, p. 208 and 250.

¹ *Delphika*, p. 205.

² *Delphika*, p. 205.

³ *Aes. Ag.* 55-9.

⁴ *Delphika*, p. 245.

⁵ *Aes. Cho.* 547 *ἐκδρακονταυεῖς δ' ἐγώ*.

⁶ *Delphika*, p. 213.

⁷ *Cho.* 1046.

⁸ *Eum. passim.*

⁹ *Delphika*, p. 207.

¹⁰ *Delphika*, p. 239.

The Eumenides is devoted to the justification of Apollo through the mouth of Athena and her Athenian court.

In it Apollo is pitted against the Erinyes. He appears as champion of a father's rights, —basing his claim upon the plea that a father's tie is closer than the mother's,— and is arraigned before Athena by the Erinyes, here conceived as a collective body of champions of a mother's claim. The votes are equal and Orestes is acquitted by the ruling of Athena who further induces the Erinyes to lay aside their vindictive character and become the guardians of the city's moral and material welfare.

The victory lies with Apollo and by Apollo's victory, hard won though it was, in a point in which his authority was strained and tested to the uttermost, Aeschylus once more, as in the Septem,¹ unhesitatingly upholds the religion of Delphi.

Turning to Euripides we find the main business of his *Electra* to be criticism: criticism certainly of Aeschylus, possibly of Sophocles, and, most deliberate of all, of the Delphic Apollo.

In spirit and in form the play is a criticism, amounting in parts to burlesque, of Aeschylus' *Choephoroi* and an oracle of Apollo is again the chief motive for the action: but in direct contrast to Aeschylus, Apollo is in the end discredited by the general conscience.

Euripides presents the same problem as Aeschylus, but registers his horror of Aeschylus' justification of Orestes' act.

Euripides' Orestes, like Aeschylus', shrinks from matricide as from an act against nature. As in the *Choephoroi* Apollo enjoins the deed: but Orestes is not here sustained by his word: in his heart he doubts him: but overborne by the insistence of Electra, who knows no scruples, he defies his misgivings and commits the murder: only to be at once struck with remorse as a sudden revulsion of feeling brings home to both alike the intrinsic horror of the deed. Here too Orestes is a prey to the attacks of the Erinyes—no longer however conceived as objective avengers but as the workings of a remorseful conscience, the phantasms of a sick man's disordered brain.²

It is no matter if the Dioscuri shuffle the blame off on Apollo's folly and the hereditary curse: that is a mere blind which need deceive nobody and does not obscure

Euripides' sense of Orestes' moral responsibility or his loathing of the crime enjoined by the god, who thus in his judgment stands condemned.

If now we compare Sophocles' treatment of this story with Aeschylus' and Euripides' we find that he differs entirely from both the one and the other. In Sophocles, as in Aeschylus and Euripides, Apollo's influence underlies the play: and, as in Aeschylus, his part is justified. He does not here enjoin the deed: he only prescribes the way it must be done; for the standpoint of the play assumes the vengeance to be both natural and inevitable—contemplated by Orestes himself, looked for by Electra, needing only the sanction of the god to determine the moment and the mode of execution.³ But Sophocles goes further still; with him there is no admission of any counter claim. The justification of Apollo which is the burning question of the *Choephoroi* and the Eumenides is in Sophocles tacitly assumed.

Orestes' action in killing the murderers of his father, in obedience to the traditional law of blood for blood reinforced in this case by the special mandate of Apollo, is regarded as unquestionably righteous. There is here no moral strain; no flinching beforehand, or compunction after. It is a divine mission simply and solemnly discharged which rids the house of the hereditary curse.⁴

With criticism like that of Euripides Sophocles had obviously nothing in common, but surely Aeschylus' frank presentment of Apollo on his trial would be no less repugnant to him.

The ethics of Aeschylus are rooted in the two sayings *δράσαντι παθεῖν* (*Cho.* 312) and *τῷ πάθει μάθειν* (*Ag.* 187). A sense of struggle is of the very essence of his creed and from this law of our being Zeus himself is not exempt.

Aeschylus recurs again and again to the rivalry of the old order and the new: for example in *Prom.* V. 155-8

νέοι γὰρ οἰακονόμοι κρατοῦσ' Ὀλύμπου
νεοχμοῖς δὲ δὴ νόμοις Ζεὺς
ἀθέτως κρατύνει,
τὰ πρὶν δὲ πελώρια νῦν αἰστοῦ.⁵

and Agamem. vv 170-193 is significant as the expression of the thought that the greater spirituality of Zeus had not with-

¹ Aes. Sep. 785-7.

² Eur. Orest. and Iph. in Taur.

³ Soph. El. 37, 1263.

⁴ Soph. El. 1508-10.

⁵ And cp. P. V. 216-20.

out struggle replaced the reign of brute force of his predecessors, Ouranos and Kronos.¹ That this rivalry of old and new lies at the heart of the Eumenides² we have already seen. But Sophocles, naturally orthodox and lacking the strenuous originality of Aeschylus, rests on the sense of an ordered and harmonious universe controlled by Zeus.

As in Aeschylus the supremacy of Zeus is attested many times, as in Antig. 605-10,

τεῶν, Ζεῦ, δύνασιν τίς ἀνδρῶν ὑπερβασία κατὰσ-
χοι;
τὰν οὐθ' ὕπνος αἰρεῖ ποθ' ὁ πάντ' ἀγρεύων
οὔτε θεῶν ἄκματοι μῆνες. ἀγῆρως δὲ χρόνῳ
δυνάστας κατέχουσ' Ὀλύμπου μαρμαρόεσσαν
αἶγλαν.

or Electra 174-5,

ἔτι μέγας οὐράνῳ
Ζεὺς ὅς ἐφορᾷ πάντα καὶ κρατύνει.

or in the despairing and defiant cry of Hyllus (Trach. 1278)

κ' οὐδὲν τούτων ὅτι μὴ Ζεὺς.³

And of all the other gods and goddesses of Olympus the nearest to Zeus is Apollo.

Again as in Aeschylus, his is the voice by which Zeus speaks to men. His oracle is hailed as Διὸς ἀδυσπέτς φάτι, (Oed. Tyr. 151-3). Again and again their names are linked together as in Oed. Tyr. 499-500

ἄλλ' ὁ μὲν οὖν Ζεὺς ὁ τ' Ἀπόλλων ξυνετοὶ καὶ
τὰ βροτῶν
εἰδότες.⁴

But unlike Aeschylus there is nothing to show that Sophocles did not conceive of this ordered harmony having existed under the direction of Zeus and Apollo from all time. For who shall date the 'unwritten laws' that Antigone feared to break?⁵

Such a conception admitted of no consciousness of conflicting claims. God's word was law, no matter where it led: to question it would be a blasphemy. For Sophocles to represent Apollo then as fighting for rights imperilled by a counter-claim of the Erinyes would assuredly be foreign to his point of view.

Is it not then conceivable that Sophocles consciously sought to avoid a version in which Apollo and the Erinyes were

brought into active collision as representatives of opposing claims: and that, casting about for a way of escape from the current version of the tale, he found it in reverting in some measure to the lines of the Homeric prototype? If this is so we find the explanation of this individual treatment of the story in the temperament of Sophocles himself.

In the Homeric version Clytaemnestra's part is wholly secondary. It is not she, but Aegisthus who kills Agamemnon, though aided by her wiles:⁶ and it is Aegisthus that Orestes kills in requital, for which deed Athena holds him up as a pattern to the young Telemachus.⁷

That he also slew Clytaemnestra is nowhere explicitly stated,⁸ though her death at the same time as Aegisthus' is implied in the mention of the funeral feast that Orestes made for the Argives 'for his hateful mother and the coward Aegisthus.'⁹

One is by no means bound to assume that the story of a fury-hunted Orestes was necessarily of later origin than the Homeric poems: but at any rate for the Odyssey the story stops short with the death of Aegisthus and there is no hint of trouble to come.

Here then is a version in which neither Apollo nor the Erinyes have any part, in which therefore all contentious element is lacking. But by the time of Sophocles the part of Clytaemnestra as the murderess was established, as also her death in requital at Orestes' hands and the consequent pursuit of Orestes by her Erinyes.

Apollo too had become an integral part of the story to oppose the claims of the Erinyes, to give expiation to Orestes and to demonstrate the authority of Delphi. Sophocles could not therefore take the Homeric legend as it stood: but by following Homeric lines, in subordinating the part of Clytaemnestra to that of Aegisthus, so that Aegisthus' death, not hers, is the culminating point of the play, and by alienating all sympathy from Clytaemnestra, he contrived to readjust the focus, making it more possible to depict Orestes as a well-doer and to neglect the Erinyes of Clytaemnestra.

He could not as I have said dispense with Apollo: but that is the last thing

¹ Cf. Dr. Verrall's note on vv. 170, 178-85, 192-3.

² See p. 196.

³ And cf. Ant. 184, Trach. 275, Oed. Col. 1085.

⁴ And cf. Oed. Col. 623, and 792-3, and Ajax 186-7.

⁵ Ant. 450. 7. And cf. Oed. Tyr. 865-871.

⁶ Od. iv. 90-92.

⁷ Od. i. 293-302.

⁸ Except in Od. xxiv. 97, 200, both of which lines occur in a passage generally regarded as an interpolation.

⁹ Od. iii. 309.

he would have wished to do. He wished not to eliminate, but to magnify his part; and though robbed of the very function for which he originally came into the story—for matricide leaves seemingly no stain and therefore calls for no purification—Apollo is more than ever here the backbone of the play. He is prominent from first to last and every crisis in the story is punctuated by a reference to him.¹

Nor again could Sophocles eliminate the Erinyes: but with consummate skill the Erinyes themselves are made to serve his end.

No Erinyes are waked by the mother-murder: but the Erinyes of the murdered Agamemnon are active, not in opposition to, but in concert with Apollo.

The Erinyes as the avengers of wrong are invoked by Electra to come to her aid (El. 110-116)

ὦ δῶμ' Ἀΐδου καὶ Περσεφόνης
ὦ χθονί' Ἑρμῇ καὶ πότνι' Ἀρά,
σεμναί τε θεῶν παῖδες Ἑρινύες,
αἱ τοὺς ἀδίκους θνήσκοντας ὀράθ',
αἱ τοὺς εὐνάς ὑποκλεπτομένους,
ἔλθετ' ἀρήξατε, τείσασθε πατρὸς
φόνον ἡμετέρου . .

Clytaemnestra fears no Erinyes though she consorts with the man that was her accomplice in the murder (El. 275-6)

ἡ δ' ὥδε τλήμων ὥστε τῷ μιάστροι
ξύνεστ' Ἑρινὺν οὖν' ἐκφοβουμένη.

The chorus are confident that the Erinyes of Agamemnon will yet come. (El. 489-490)

ἤξει καὶ πολύπους καὶ πολύχηρ
ἀ δεινοῖς κρυπτομένα λόχοις χαλκόπους Ἑρινύς
and finally Orestes and Pylades enter the house to effect the vengeance as the ἄφυκτοι κύνες of Agamemnon—as the vehicle of his Erinyes. (El. 1388).

In a case then where conflicting claims might well be urged Sophocles assumes for his Erinyes the standpoint of Apollo in the Eumenides and espouses the father's as against the mother's claim.

Elsewhere in the plays this question does not arise. An examination of the references to the Erinyes in the other plays reveals them in the same rather shifting character as has been already noted in the case of Aeschylus. They are avengers, curse-spirits, more or less detached, often but not necessarily or always concerned to punish sins against kin.

¹ Soph. El. 32-37, 637 seq., 1264, 1376, seq., 1425.

In *Antigone* they are cited as avengers of wronged kinsmen (Ant. 1075): in the Trachinians of a wrong done by a wife to her husband (a wrong that the Erinyes of Aeschylus' Eumenides² refused to recognise) (Trach. 807-9) and again by one house to another (Trach. 893-5). In the *Ajax* the Erinyes is simply an avenger irrespective of blood-tie: (*Ajax* 837, 843, 1034, 1390), and so too in Trachinians 1051 and *Antigone* 600.

In the *Oedipus* plays we find again the conjunction of the Erinyes and Apollo: but in this case Sophocles is in line with Aeschylus in the *Septem*³; for the interests of Apollo and the Erinyes are here at one. For disobedience to the oracle of Apollo the house of Laius is dogged with misfortune: crime follows crime: and each fresh crime is regarded as the working of the Erinyes, who is here, as in the *Septem*,⁴ as it were the embodied curse: first the curse of Laius which drives Oedipus, an unconscious victim, to kill his father and marry his mother, exposing him to the double curse of father and of mother (Oed. Tyr. 417-18)

καὶ σ' ἀμφιπλήξῃ μητρός τε καὶ τοῦ σοῦ πατρὸς
ἐλᾷ ποτ' ἐκ γῆς τῆσδε δεινόπους ἀρά.

And then in the *Oedipus Coloneus*, though Oedipus, after much suffering,—

ἐπεὶ τά γ' ἔργα μου
πεπονθός ἐστι μάλλον ἢ δεδρακότα
Oed. Col. 266-7.—

is ultimately reconciled to Apollo and the Erinyes in their character of Eumenides or Semnai,⁵ his curse is in its turn transmitted to his sons who were guilty of impiety towards him.

ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ μὲν ἦδ' ὁδός
ἔσται μέλουσα, δύσποτμός τε καὶ κακή
πρὸς τοῦδε πατρὸς τῶν τε τοῦδ' Ἑρινύων.
Oed. Col. 1432-4.

The Erinyes are throughout the ministers of Apollo, and in *Oedipus Tyrannus* 469, by what Miss Harrison calls a 'mythological inversion,' they are actually said to attend upon him,⁶

δειναὶ δ' αὖ' ἔπονται
κῆρες ἀναπλάκῃτοι.

Sophocles then far from presenting the younger God in collision with the elder

² Aes. Eum. 604-5.

³ Sep. 706-776.

⁴ Aes. Sep. 69, 642, etc.

⁵ Oed. Col. cf. Aes. Eum.

⁶ Delphika, p. 246.

race of deities gives only the resultant fusion, a fusion so perfect that the Erinyes can actually be described by him as the *followers* of Apollo himself.

It is then perhaps not unreasonable to suppose that Sophocles in his treatment of the Orestes story should have rejected the

open conflict between the two as presented by Aeschylus—as an aspect of things that could not exist for him—and should have had recourse to another version that would not jar upon the sense of harmony which is the ground-work of his religion.

JANET CASE.

'Ακραγής AND AGRIGENTUM.

'Οξύστομος γὰρ Ζηὸς ἀκραγὲς κύνας
Γρύπας φύλαξαι.—Aesch. *Prom.* 804.

It is surprising that the translation of ἀκραγὲς by 'not barking,' already rejected by Hermann and Weil, should continue to be repeated by recent editors of the play. Aeschylean usage here requires,—this is admitted,—a 'qualifying epithet' to the metaphorical word κύνας. But such qualifying epithets must point to some feature in the thing signified, to which its metaphorical name does not correspond. Now we know that the peculiar feature, by which gryphons were distinguished from ordinary quadrupeds, was that they had the heads of eagles. The epithet therefore must indicate something which is not true of dogs, but *is true of eagles*. Nothing could be less suitable than ἀκραγὲς in the sense of οὐ κρίζοντες, for κρίζειν denotes, strictly speaking, the cry of ravens and rooks, and, if used in the more general sense of 'making a noise,' it would apply to eagles as much as to dogs. That the gryphons were *silent* 'a nemine relatum est' (Weil). The meaning of ἀκραγής was already unknown to the ancient scholars. It is confused with another word ἀκραγής,

and (with this passage in view), the most various meanings are assigned it,—ἀφωνος, αἰὲ κρίζων, χαλεπός, δυσχερής, σκληρός, αὐστηρός, ἀκρόχολος, ἀπεχθής, ἀσθενής. (Scholia, Hesych., *Etym. Magn.*) This ignorance suggests that the word belonged to some provincial dialect. Now we know that Aeschylus especially affected Sicilian words, e.g. ἀρμοί, *Prom.* 616, ἀσχεδωρος, *frag.* 273, and perhaps βοῖνις, *Suppl.* 776. ὅτι δὲ Αἰσχύλος, διατρίψας ἐν Σικελίᾳ, πολλὰς κέρηται φωναῖς Σικελικαῖς οὐδὲν θαυμαστόν. *Athen.* ix., 402 b. And here comes in a circumstance which may be worth noting in this connexion. The city of Akragas (Agrigentum) in Sicily has the eagle for its regular emblem on the coins. These emblems, it is well known, often belong to the class of 'canting devices,' e.g. the parsley of Selinus, the apple of Melos, the seal of Phokaia, the bent arm (ἀγκών) of Ancona, etc. When therefore we find Akragas represented by the eagle, and a meaning which connects it with the eagle required for ἀκραγὲς in Aeschylus, we have perhaps more than a chance coincidence.

E. R. BEVAN.

AN EMENDATION OF EURIPIDES BACCHAE 240.

MAY I call attention to a difficulty in Euripides' Bacchae which as far as I can discover has been for the most part overlooked? I refer to the phrase κτυποῖντα θύρσον (l. 240). Dr. Sandys passes over the passage without comment. Dr. Tyrrell on the other hand has the following note: 'I will not have him *making his thyrses whistle through the air*, etc.' Unless the thyrses could be *cracked like a whip* it is hard to see what else κτυποῖντα θύρσον can mean.'

Surely neither alternative can be called satisfactory. In the first place the natural meaning of κτυποῖντα has to be very much strained. Secondly all the evidence of ancient literature and art goes against the supposition that the θύρσος was pliant, and so able to be 'cracked' like a whip. It is called κίσσινον βάκτρον or βέλος and is generally depicted as a rigid staff, ivy-wreathed and surmounted by a pine cone.

It seems that the reading must be at fault.

Might I suggest *βύρσαν* *vice* *θύρσον*? This gives excellent sense and presents no special palaeographical difficulty. Musgrave supposes a similar corruption of *θάλλει* to *βάλλει* in line 1186. Cf. also line 955. If *θύρσαν* were once written *vice* *βύρσαν* the next copyist would be sure to 'correct' it to *θύρσον*. As Housman remarks on another

passage, 'the scribe's head would be full of thyrsi.'

It may further be noted that the phrase *βύρσης κτύπος* occurs in line 513 of the play.

R. B. CROSS.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

ADVERSARIA DEMOSTHENICA.

(1) Dem. 36 (*pro Phormione*) § 38 τῆς ἐξ ἀρχῆς νευθεΐσης οὐσίας. This is still, even in the last edition of Sandys and Paley, explained as the shield factory and a reference is given to § 11. The editor does not observe that, were this interpretation correct, we should have the rent from the factory *twice over*, here and in § 37, where it is for the first 8 years included in the rent of the whole business and then reckoned for 10 years singly. The true explanation is to be derived from § 9, where we read that the guardians divided with Apollodorus all the property except the business leased to Phormio: this was divided later when the lease fell in.

(2) [Dem.] 45 (*in Stephanum* 1) § 19 οἱδὲ δέ, τῇ προκλήσει χρῆσάμενοι παραπετάσματι, διαθήκας ἐμαρτύρησαν ὥς ἂν μάλιστα οἱ<μὲν Blass> δικάσται ταύτην τὴν διαθήκην ἐπίστευσαν τοῦ πατρὸς εἶναι, ἐγὼ δ' ἀπεκλείσθην τοῦ λόγου τυχεῖν ὑπὲρ ὧν ἀδικοῦμαι, οὗτοι δὲ φωραβεῖν τὰ ψευδῇ μεμαρτυρηκότες. Editors have made great coil over this sentence. But with Blass' insertion there seems no occasion for further hesitation. The ἂν goes with φωραβεῖν only; cf. [Dem.] 46 (*in Stephanum* 2) § 19 and Gebauer's comment quoted by Sandys; the indicatives are independent of it; and the whole sentence is 'deposed to a will in that way in which, *although* the jury believed... and I was debarred... yet they can most easily be convicted.' Had the speaker not interposed his μὲν clauses, there would be no difficulty.

(3) § 28 πρὸ τῆς προκλήσεως MSS., emended by Reiske to μετὰ, by Dobree to διά. The MS. reading seems endurable if we translate πρὸ 'instead of,' cf. § 19, the sense being 'instead of this challenge that they ostensibly make so much of, they have really been deposing to this will under cloak of the challenge.'

(4) § 59 καίτοι ὅστις ὁ ἄνθρωπος Ἀθηναῖος κακῶν ἀλλοτρίων κλέπτῃς ὑπέμειν' ὀνομασθῆναι, τί ἂν ἡγείσθε ποιῆσαι τοῦτον ἄλλον του FSQ (ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ γρ FQ). Sandys reads ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ. Some years ago I proposed κακῶν ἕνεκα τῶν ἀλλοτρίων. But I then failed to grasp the important fact that nowhere in the speech is there any suggestion that Stephanus has done any thing *for himself*: and if this fact may be disregarded and the sentence be looked on as empty rhetoric, another fact cannot be disregarded: the parallel passage in § 62 makes it certain that the antithesis I then suggested was on the wrong lines. There, to summarize the argument of §§ 57-61, we have: ἄρ' οὖν ἂν ὑμῖν αἰσχυρῆναι δοκεῖ τὴν τοῦ τὰ ψευδῇ μαρτυρεῖν δόξαν, ὃ τὴν τοῦ κλέπτῃς φανῆναι μὴ φηγών; ἢ δεηθέντος ὀκνήσαι τὰ ψευδῇ μαρτυρεῖν, ὃς ἂ μὴδεὶς ἐκέλευ' ἐθελοντὴς πονηρὸς ἦν; It seems clear then, that, as Sauppe said, the sense would be satisfied if we had at the end of § 59 *διομένου του* or the like. I suggest therefore (i) that κακῶν conceals χάκων (= καὶ ἐκῶν) and (ii) that ἄλλον του of the MSS. is sound and means 'for another's sake,' this rare use of the genitive being the cause of the variant mentioned in FQ, originating in an adscript comment, ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ i.e. 'FOR HIS (another's) SAKE.' This genitive seems to have been unnecessarily ousted by editors also in Aristotle *Ἀθ. Πολ.* 35 § 2. Cf. [Dem.] 46 (*in Stephanum* 2) § 10 Νόμος B. B. As for ἀλλοτρίων κλέπτῃς it is simply a rhetorical amplification of κλέπτῃς, and it is just because this amplification was common that Aristophanes' joke in *Ranae* 611 is so pointed. The addition of ἀλλοτρίων is *not* to point any contrast with the second half of the sentence.

T. NICKLIN.

NOTE ON PLATO'S *PHAEDO*, 115 D.

In the recently published *Sitzungsbericht* of the Munich Academy of Sciences for 1900, p. 619 ff., Wecklein takes as his text Plato's *Phaedo* 115 D: ἐγγήσασθε οὖν με πρὸς Κρίτωνα, ἔφη, τὴν ἐναντίαν ἐγγύην ἣ ἦν οὗτος πρὸς τοὺς δικαστὰς ἡγγυᾶτο. οὗτος μὲν γὰρ ἦ μὴν παραμενεῖν, κτλ. He asks for what did Crito offer security. Not, as Stallbaum suggested, that Socrates should remain in prison if he were condemned to imprisonment for life. After their vote for Socrates's condemnation, the judges had three sentences open to them—to fine, to imprisonment, and to death—and Socrates considers them all, explicitly rejecting the thought of life-long imprisonment. After their second vote, Crito could have had no opportunity to appeal to the judges for an essential modification of the sentence. Further, if Socrates were condemned to imprisonment for life, it would be the legal duty of the prison authorities to keep him, not his duty to remain.

Wecklein thinks that the offer of security ἡ παραμενεῖν must have been made to the officers of the prison (δικαστὰς in some way having taken the place in our text of α'), in order to induce them to allow Socrates's friends to visit him during the month of his imprisonment. Yet Crito during that month is said to have endeavoured to persuade Socrates to escape from prison. These statements seem to Wecklein so inconsistent that (following Diogenes Laertius) he believes Aeschines, not Crito, to have been the friend who urged the escape. The dialogue called *Crito* he holds to be un-Platonic—the work of a scholar of Plato's, composed at his suggestion.

Natorp (*Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, Feb. 1, 1902) accepts Wecklein's theory of the subject of the security, but believes Crito may have been willing to lose the sum which he had pledged as security ('bail'), and to meet the personal risk involved—finding the only inconsistency in the omission in the *Crito* of all mention of the security.

But Wecklein's theory of the reason for offering security is unsatisfactory. Here, too, we may ask why security should be required of Socrates as a condition for the admission of friends to his cell. That, in general, the friends of a condemned man were admitted to the prison, seems to be

indicated clearly enough in the early part of the same dialogue (58 c), where Echeocrates asks 'Who of his friends were present?' Here, too, it was the gaoler's duty to keep his prisoner, and Socrates was kept in chains (*Phaedo* 60 c); the courtesy of the gaoler's attendants and certain other privileges for visitors had been purchased with fees (*Crito* 43 A).

A more positive and apparently fatal objection to Wecklein's theory is the use of the conative imperfect ἡγγυᾶτο, which indicates distinctly that the offer was not accepted—yet the friends were admitted. The bond was not desired by the State, on this theory, and yet was offered unnecessarily by Crito.

To what offer of Crito, then, does the passage before us refer? Generally it seems to be referred to Crito's offer to give bonds for the payment of a fine which should be imposed on Socrates—*Apology* 37 c Πάτρων δὲ ὅδε...καὶ Κρίτων...κελεύονσί με τριάκοντα μὲν τιμῆσασθαι, αὐτοὶ δ' ἐγγυᾶσθαι. But evidently this does not explain in any way ἡ μὴν παραμενεῖν. And why should Crito alone be named as bondsman in the *Phaedo*, while three others were associated with him according to the *Apology*?

Neither of the preceding explanations are satisfactory—not again to mention Stallbaum's, which his successor, Wohlrab, has withdrawn. Perhaps the hint of a solution of the difficulty may be gained by asking what was peculiar in Socrates's case. Evidently that he was kept in prison for a month after condemnation, because of the absence of the festal ship which had been sent to Delos. In general Athenian citizens were not kept in gaol, and since up to the very hour of his trial Socrates had enjoyed full personal liberty, his friends may have offered bonds that he would not leave Athens during the absence of the *θεωρία*, but that on the return of the ship he would present himself to the Eleven, to meet his sentence. This would spare Socrates the rather unusual indignity of prison life for such an offence. But the request was not granted by the court, to which naturally enough it was made, such a modification of the sentence belonging rather to the judges than to the gaolers.

T. D. SEYMOUR.

Μεγαλοπρέπεια AND Μεγαλοψυχία IN ARISTOTLE.

IN an able paper read before the Oxford Philological Society, Mr. J. Solomon of Balliol, a propos of a well-known passage in the Republic in which *μεγαλοπρεπείς* occurs, drew attention to the question indirectly suggested by Cope's notes to Rhet. I. ix. 11 as to whether the distinction of *μεγαλοψυχία* and *μεγαλοπρέπεια* in Arist. Eth. iv. corresponds to Attic usage. In Mitchell's Index to Isocrates is to be found an important place, referring both to *μεγαλοπρέπεια* and *μεγαλοψυχία*, which puts the answer to the question beyond doubt. Isocrates (Evagoras, p. 189 a *sqq.*) after praising Nicocles as *τιμῶντα... τὸν τάφον τοῦ πατρὸς οὐ μόνον τῷ πλήθει καὶ τῷ κάλλει τῶν ἐπιφερομένων, ἀλλὰ καὶ χοροῖς καὶ μουσικῇ καὶ γυμνικοῖς ἀγῶσιν, ἔτι δὲ πρὸς τοῖς ἵππων τε καὶ τριώνων ἀμίλλαις κ.τ.λ.*, calls this behaviour *μεγαλοπρέπεια*: then directly after he speaks of the *μεγαλόψυχος* in terms which accord exactly with Aristotle's conception of *μεγαλοψυχία*:—*εὐρήσμεν γὰρ τοὺς φιλοτίμους καὶ μεγαλόψυχους τῶν ἀνδρῶν οὐ μόνον ἀντὶ τῶν τοιοῦτων ἔπαινεῖσθαι βουλομένους, ἀλλ' ἀντὶ τοῦ ζῆν ἀποθνήσκειν εὐκόλως αἰρουμένους, καὶ μᾶλλον περὶ τῆς δόξης ἢ περὶ τοῦ βίου σπουδάζοντας, καὶ πάντα ποιούντας ὅπως ἀθάνατον τὴν περὶ αὐτῶν μνήμην καταλείψουσι.* This is an in-

teresting confirmation of Prof. Bywater's often expressed opinion that it is important for the idiom and for the topics of Aristotle to study Isocrates, and I find he is familiar with this passage and its bearing.

The passage also contains a parallel to a well known place in Aristotle's Ethics, Bk. I:—Evag. 189 a fin., *εἴ τίς ἐστὶν αἰσθησις τοῖς τετελευτηκόσι περὶ τῶν ἐνθαδε γιγνομένων.*

The index gives two other instances of *μεγαλοψυχία* in Isocrates which agree entirely with Aristotle's use: and the instances of *μικροψυχία* also amply confirm it.

Of three other instances of *μεγαλοπρέπεια* quoted from Isocrates two are distinctly in the Aristotelian sense: a third is not so restricted in meaning, but the reading is a variant to *μεγαλοφρονεστέρως* which Bekker prefers.

The same meaning of *μεγαλοψυχία* is found in Demosthenes, but of course the special value of the first passage from Isocrates is that it gives both *μεγαλοπρέπεια* and *μεγαλοψυχία*.

Dr. L. R. Farnell points out that the Aristotelian sense of *μεγαλοπρέπεια* is familiar in Inscriptions.

J. COOK WILSON.

CICERONIAN USE OF NAM AND ENIM.

WHILE all the leading Grammars instance occasional extraordinary use of these two particles in classical Latinity, no attempt has been made to contrast them definitely in meaning. The nearest approach to consideration of this view of the particles, so far as I am aware, is the statement by Gildersleeve and Lodge that 'a broad difference between *nam* and *enim* cannot be proved.' What would constitute 'a broad difference' in such a case is not stated.

With a view to obtaining definite information in regard to a contrasted use of these particles, I have examined carefully several of the works of Cicero, and I venture to submit briefly to readers of this *Review* the results of my investigation up to this point.

The following figures show the comparative frequency of *nam* and *enim* in several of the Ciceronian writings.

		<i>Enim.</i>	<i>Nam.</i>
DE ORATORE	Lib. 1	98	39
(<i>Etenim</i> , 7; <i>Namque</i> , 3)			
	Lib. 2	172	72
(<i>Etenim</i> , 10; <i>Namque</i> , 4)			
	Lib. 3	89	50
(<i>Etenim</i> , 5; <i>Namque</i> , 5; <i>At enim</i> , 2)			

		<i>Enim.</i>	<i>Nam.</i>
DE OFFICIIS	Lib. 1	111	31
(<i>Etenim</i> , 4; <i>At enim</i> , 1)			
	Lib. 2	64	21
(<i>Etenim</i> , 4)			
	Lib. 3	87	32
(<i>Etenim</i> , 6; <i>At enim</i> , 2)			
IN CATILINAM	Or. 1	8	2
(<i>Etenim</i> , 4)			
	Or. 2	11	2
(<i>Etenim</i> , 1)			
	Or. 3	5	6
(<i>Etenim</i> , 3)			
	Or. 4	11	3
(<i>Etenim</i> , 4)			
LAELIUS (De Amicitia)		100	14
(<i>Namque</i> , 1)			
CATOR MAIOR (De Senectute)		71	7
(<i>Etenim</i> , 3)			
PRO SULLA		31	6
(<i>Etenim</i> , 4)			
DIVINATIO IN Q. CAECILIUM		20	8
(<i>Etenim</i> , 5; <i>At enim</i> , 2)			
IN VERREM (Actio Prima)		10	3
(<i>Etenim</i> , 4; <i>At enim</i> , 1)			

These figures show that, in the writings referred to, *enim* occurs 896 times, whereas *nam* occurs 296 times; and that *etenim* is found 64 times, while *namque* is met with 13 times. (The 8 instances of *at enim*, shown

separately, are included in the 'enim' figures).

If there be little or no definite distinction between *enim* and *nam*, why this difference in their comparative frequency? Mere predilection for one word rather than another is not a sufficient reason. If we regard the collocation of these particles with other words—apart from their respective positions at the commencement of a sentence—it will be found to be identical, to all intents and purposes, with the one exception that, whereas *nam* is found not infrequently in conjunction with a *quidem* combination (*nam illud quidem*, etc.), this is never the case, of course, with *enim*. *Neque enim* is frequent. *Nam neque* is, on the other hand, comparatively rare.

A few instances, from the above cited works, in which *nam* and *enim* sentences follow each other, either immediately or in close succession, will best serve to illustrate what I conceive to be the underlying distinction in the Ciceronian use of these particles. The instances are cited in the order of their occurrence.

De Officiis, Lib. 1. c. 8 § 26: 'Quod enim est apud Ennium . . . id latius patet. Nam quidquid eiusmodi est . . . in eo fit plerumque tanta contentio . . .' I would render this passage as follows: 'As to the saying of Ennius . . . that, *you will agree* (enim) has a wider application. *Inasmuch as* (nam) whatever is of such a kind . . . commonly begets such keen competition. . . .' Other cases of juxtaposition will be found at 9. 28; 10. 32; 14. 42; 17. 53.4; and 29. 102.

De Officiis, Lib. 2. c. 14 § 51: 'Atque etiam hoc praeceptum . . . tenendum est, ne quem unquam innocentem iudicio capitis accessas: id enim sine scelere fieri nullo pacto potest. Nam quid est tam inhumanum quam eloquentiam . . . ad bonorum pestem perneciemque convertere?' 'Yes, and this precept as well . . . ought to be observed: Never arraign an innocent person on a capital charge—that, *clearly* (enim), cannot be done without crime, no matter how you contrive. *For*, what is so unnatural, etc.' See also at c. 21 § 73.

De Officiis, Lib. 3 c. 5. § 21. To take anything wrongfully from another for the sake of one's own advantage is more repellant to nature than death itself. This is Cicero's opinion, and he follows it up thus: 'Nam principio tollit coniectum humanum et societatem. Si enim sic erimus affecti, ut propter suum quisque emolumentum spoliaretur . . . dirumpi necesse est eam . . . humani generis societatem.' This may be translated:

'*Seeing that* (nam), at the very outset, it does away with human intercourse and fellowship. *For as might be expected* (enim), if we are to be so disposed that each for his own gain shall spoil another . . . it is inevitable that the fellowship of mankind be torn asunder.'

Other references: 17. 69, 70; 28. 101; 29. 104; 30. 110; and 33. 117.

In Catilinam, 3 c. 2 § 3: 'Nam tum, cum ex urbe Catilinam ejiciebam, non enim iam vereor huius verbi invidiam. . . .' *Inasmuch as* (nam) at the very time I was trying to drive Catiline out of Rome—for, *mark you* (enim), I am not afraid now of the odium attaching to this expression. . . .

And again at c. 10 § 23: 'Nam multi saepe honores dis immortalibus iusti habiti sunt ac debiti, sed profecto iustiores nunquam. Erepti enim estis ex crudelissimo ac miserrimo interitu.' '*Seeing that* (nam) many honours, on many occasions, have been considered not less the due than the right of the immortal deities, but never, assuredly, have they been more justly so. *For you have been snatched, and you know it* (enim), from a most cruel, aye and most pitiable destruction.' *In Catilinam*, 4 c. 6 § 11: 'Quamquam, patres conscripti, quae potest esse in tanti sceleris immanitate punienda crudelitas? ego enim de meo sensu iudico. Nam ita mihi salua republica uobiscum perfrui liceat ut ego. . . . non atrocitate animi moueor—quis est enim me mitior?'—'And yet, Conscrip't Fathers, what cruelty can there be . . . ? I, *of course* (enim) am judging by my own feeling in the matter. *In so far that* (nam), as truly as I wish to enjoy with you the benefit of the assured safety of the State, so truly am I not influenced by harsh sentiment—for who, *I ask you* (enim), is more gentle than I?'

Cato Maior, c. 21 § 77: 'Nam dum sumus in his inclusi compagibus corporis, munere quodam necessitatis et graui opere perfungimur. Est enim animus caelestis ex altissimo domicilio depressus. . . .' Life begins with the freedom of the soul, at death. Life here below is not worthy the name, says old Cato: '*In that* (nam), as long as we are imprisoned within these confines of the flesh, we are fulfilling a given function and wearisome task of destiny. *For be it remembered* (enim), the heaven-born soul has been thrust out, and down, from its lofty abode. . . .' Other instances of juxtaposition, and, as I conceive, of contrasted force in meaning, will be found in *Laelius*, 5, 19; 8, 26; 22, 85; 25, 92; in *De Oratore*: *Lib.* 1 32, 145; 33, 151; and 47, 204; *Lib.* 2. 7,

30; 15, 62; 19, 76, 77; 21, 88, 53, 213; and 54, 220; *Lib.* 3. 21, 79; 28, 110; and 59, 221.

The results of a careful examination of all the passages in which *enim* or *nam* occurs, in those writings of Cicero to which reference has been made in this article, may be summed up as follows. *Enim* is employed by Cicero to introduce, in reference to a preceeding statement, expressed or implied,

- (a) a corroborative, and thus in a measure explanatory, statement, in which there is always an implied appeal, for acceptance or confirmation, to individual or general knowledge, experience or expectation. The elliptic force of *enim* in these cases may be rendered variously; *for, to be sure; for, of course; for, clearly; for, as you know; for as you might or would expect; for, you will agree; for, I need hardly say; for, I take it; &c.*

Ex. 'Quibus *enim* nihil est in ipsis opis ad bene beateque uiuendum, iis omnis grauis est aetas,' *Cata Maior*, 2 § 4. *enim* = *for*, obviously, clearly. Cp. Ger. *freilich*.

'docuit *enim* iam nos longa uita ususque rerum maximarum, ut quibus rebus animi hominum mouerentur, teneremus,' *De Oratore*, *Lib.* 2. 50 § 204. *Enim* = *for*, as might be expected. (Long, in his edition of Caesar, *De Bello Gallico*, points out a similar use of *enim* at *Lib.* 5 c. 8, 'Ille *enim* reuocatus...resistere coepit.')

'Inueterauit *enim* iam opinio perniciosa reipublicae nobisque periculosa,' *In C. Verrem*, *Actio Prima* 1 § 1. *Enim* = *for*, as you are aware.

- (b) a corroborative, rhetorical question—always with an implied appeal for assent, and nearly always immediately followed by further questions, but without repetition of the particle. In these cases *enim* = *for*, I ask you: Come, now!; or some such phrase.

Ex. 'Quae *enim* domus tam stabilis, quae tam firma ciuitas est, quae non odiis atque discidiis funditus possit

euerti?' *Laelius* c. 7 § 23. *Enim* = *for*, I ask you.

'Quid est *enim*, Catilina, quod te iam in hac urbe delectare possit?' *In Catilinam* 1 c. 6 § 13.

'Quid *enim* est, quam ob rem abs te Q. Hortensii factum . . . non reprehendatur, reprehendatur meum?' *Pro Sulla* 1 § 3.

- (c) a strong asseveration, which, it is assumed, will not be gainsaid. *Enim* is here equivalent to some such phrase as: *for, I tell you; for, mark you; for be it remembered; for, assuredly; &c.*

Ex. 'conuincam, si negas; uideo *enim* esse hic in senatu quosdam, qui tecum una fuerunt,' *In Catilinam*, 1 c. 4 § 8.

'Tum, Antonius, Heri *enim*, inquit, hoc mihi proposueram, ut, si te refellissem, hos abs te discipulos abducerem,' *De Oratore*, *Lib.* 2 c. 10 § 40. (This passage is cited by Madvig, *Grammar* § 454 Obs. 2, where the force of '*yes, for*' is assigned to *enim*).

'Impedit *enim* consilium uoluptas,' *Cato Maior*, c. 12 § 42.

'Defendo *enim* multos mortales, multas ciuitates, prouinciam Siciliam totam,' *In Q. Cassilium Diuinatione*, c. 2 § 5.

- (d) a corroborative instance; with the implication that its aptness is obvious. *Enim* = *for* instance (you will remember); *for* example (you know); &c.

Ex. 'Accipite *enim*, optimi adulescentes, ueterem orationem Archytæ . . .,' *Cato Maior*, 12 § 30. Now listen, *for example*, to the old speech, &c.

'Nunc *enim* apud Philonem, quem in Academia maxime uigere audio, etiam harum iam causarum cognitio exercitatioque celebratur,' *De Oratore*, *Lib.* 3 c. 28 § 110.

(e) an *interjectional* remark, in which the particle has a somewhat *concessional* force, Well then! Cp. Fr. *Eh, bien!* This use of *enim* is very rare. The following is the only example that I have met with, so far, in Cicero. (From one of the old Lexicons I obtained a reference to *enim* in this particular sense at Livy 23, 45: 'Romam uos expugnaturus, si quis duceret, fortes lingua iactabatis: *enim* minor est res: hic experiri uim uirtutemque uolo.')'

Ex. 'Quamquam, o di boni! quid est in hominis uita diu? Da *enim* supremum tempus: expectemus Tartessorum regis aetatem.' *Cato Maior*, c. 19 § 69. Take, if you will, an extreme limit, &c. (Sommerbrodt, following Otto, brackets *enim* as an interpolation—unnecessarily, I think).

Not a few cases occur in which *enim* might be classed under either (a) or (c), but in the majority of such cases the context will be found to present sufficient reasons for a definite decision.

In all cases, what might perhaps be termed the enclitic force of *enim*, by which emphasis is thrown back upon the word, or words, which precede the particle, is very noticeable, though not altogether unexpected, in view of its position in a Latin sentence.

The use of *Etenim* and *At enim* does not present any difficulty. The prefixing of *et* and *at*, though modifying, does not fundamentally alter, the signification of the particle.

NAM is employed to introduce, in reference to a preceding statement, expressed or implied,

(a) an *explanatory*, and thus distinctly corroborative, *statement* which qualifies that which precedes by restricting its application to a particular instance. The elliptic force of *nam* in such cases may be rendered: *Forasmuch as*; *inasmuch as*; *in that*; *in so far that*; *seeing that* &c.

Ex. 'quam spem cogitationum et consiliorum meorum, cum graues communium temporum, tum uarii nostri casus fefellerunt. *Nam*, qui locus quietis et tranquilli-

tatis plenissimus fore uidebatur, in eo maxime molestiarum et turbulentissimae tempestates exstiterunt.' *De Oratore*, Lib. 1. l. § 2.

'quo ego adiumento sperabam hanc a me posse molestiam demoueri, id mihi erat aduersarium maxime: *nam* illi multo mihi hoc facilius remisissent, si istum non nossent aut si iste apud eos quaestor non fuisset.' *In Q. Caecilium Divinatio*, c. 2 § 4.

'Neque ego praecipue de consularibus disputo; *nam* haec et hominum ornatissimorum, qui praetores fuerunt, et uniuersi senatus communis est laus ut . . .'

Pro Sulla, 29 § 82.

(b) a *parenthetical statement* or *question*, serving as a loose corollary to a preceding statement. *Nam* is equivalent to some such phrase as: *This being so*; *after this*; *in view of this* &c.

Ex. 'Plurimum in amicitia . . . ualeat auctoritas, eaque et adhibeatur ad monendum non modo aperte sed etiam acriter, si res postulabit, et adhibitae pareatur. *Nam* quibusdam, quos audio sapientes habitos in Graecia, placuisse opinor mirabilia quaedam;' *Laelius* c. 13 § 45.

'Una domus erat, idem uictus isque communis, neque militia solum sed etiam peregrinationes rusticationesque communes. *Nam* quid ego de studiis dicam cognoscendi semper aliquid atque discendi, in quibus . . . omne otiosum tempus contriuimus?' *Laelius*, c. 27 § 103 104. (Both the foregoing passages, as also *Laelius*, c. 12 § 41 and *De Off.*, Lib. 3. c. 6 § 28, are cited by Long, in a note at c. 27 of his edition of *Laelius*, as instances where *nam* introduces a subject upon which the speaker does not intend to dwell and which, after what has been

I
sign
in b
corr
var
sion
aris
nam
atte

said (or implied?) does not call for special remark.

Other instances of this peculiar force of *nam* will be found, I think, at *Laelius* c. 6 § 22 (Long has no note whatever on this awkward passage); *De Oratore*, *Lib.* 1 c. 5 § 18; c. 55 § 234; c. 60 § 254; *Lib.* 2, c. 31 § 134; c. 33 § 144; c. 67 § 271; *De Officiis*, *Lib.* 3.c. 21 § 84; and perhaps, also *In Catilinam*, 1 c. 1 § 3.

- (c) a *parenthetical* statement, *corroborative* of preceding statement in that it instances, *by anticipation*, an exception thereto. *Nam* in this case is almost equivalent to a weakened *sed*, having both an adversative and a concessional force, *Yet* (*I admit*); *although, of course*; *on the other hand* &c.

Ex. 'Facillime autem, et in optimam partem cognoscuntur adulescentes, qui se ad claros et sapientes viros . . . contulerunt: quibuscum si frequentes sunt, opinionem afferunt populo, eorum fore se similes, quos sibi ipsi delegerint ad imitandum. P. Rutilli adolescentiam ad opinionem et innocentiam, et iuris scientiam, P. Mucii commendavit domus. *Nam* L. quidem Crassus, . . . non aliunde mutuatus est, sed sibi ipse peperit maximam laudem . . . *De Off. Lib.* 2. c. 13 § 47.

(It would almost seem that *nam* and *sed* have been transposed in the last sentence. If for *nam* we were to read *sed*, and vice versa, the coherence of the whole passage would, I venture to think, be improved).

It will be noticed that the underlying significance of *nam* is practically the same in both (a) and (b). Indeed the qualifying, corroborative force of *nam* is present, in varying degree, in all three classes. Occasionally, as in the case of *enim*, there may arise difficulties in the classification of the *nam* sentences, to be solved by careful attention to the context. The use of *Namque*

is not, I think, in any way specially remarkable. The addition of the copula intensifies the restrictive force of the particle.

With a view to making the application of the foregoing remarks as clear as possible, it has been suggested that it would be advisable to point out the effect of substituting the one particle for the other in the respective clauses of some given passage. Take the following passage from *De Officiis* *Lib.* 3.c. 5. § 21: '*Nam principio tollit coniectum humanum et societatem. Si enim sic erimus affecti, ut propter suum quisque emolumentum spoliaret . . . dirumpi necesse est eam . . . humani generis societatem.*' Cicero has just declared his opinion that unrighteous dealing is more contrary to nature than death itself. Clearly this postulate requires qualification, and he accordingly qualifies it by restricting its application to human intercourse, and then proceeds to corroborate that restriction by an appeal to the obvious. Unrighteous dealing, says Cicero, is more contrary to nature than death *in respect of its resulting influence on human intercourse*. Once let unrighteous dealing be instinct within us, and the *obvious* result will be disruption of human society and fellowship. Transpose the particles and I venture to suggest that Cicero would be made to cite a single particular application, not of itself sufficient to maintain his premise, as corroborative of the general statement in his postulate. It is clear that unrighteous dealing is contrary to nature, *having regard merely to its social relationships*, but if we read '*principio enim*, etc.,' Cicero will be made to maintain, practically, that it is contrary to nature *because* of its *obvious* interference with such relationships. If, in addition, we substitute *nam* in the second sentence, in the sense of *inasmuch as*, that sentence degenerates into a mere reiteration of the previous statement, as though one should say: Unrighteous dealing is more repellant to nature than death because it would break up social relationships, in so far as it would interfere therewith.

In the passage from *Lib.* 2 c. 14 § 51 of *De Officiis*, already quoted above, the confusion resulting from substituting *enim* for *nam*, and vice versa, is still more apparent. As the passage stands, and I venture to add as reason suggests, the *enim* clause conveys a parenthetical suggestion of the *obvious* while the *nam* sentence lends point to the *generalisation* '*sine scelere fieri nullo pacto potest,*' by a reference, in the form of a rhetorical question, to a *particular* instance, to wit the

shocking abuse of the gift of eloquence when employed to arraign innocent persons on capital charges or to otherwise maliciously injure good people. Transpose the particles and the whole strength of the parenthesis 'id . . . potest' is wasted—its strength lies in the appeal to the *obviousness* of the moral truth it conveys. The particular instance of the misuse of eloquence is a restrictive corroboration of that obvious moral truth.

I would state the results of my investigations, as far as they have gone, thus briefly :

- (1) Cicero apparently uses *enim* as a corroborative and asseverative particle, only indirectly explanatory, and always with a more or less defined intimate appeal on the part of the speaker. (It is not unnatural, then, that we should find the use of *enim* most frequent in the two most intimate and charmingly chatty dialogues Cicero ever wrote, in his *Cato Maior* and his *Laelius*.)
- (2) Cicero employs *nam* as an explanatory and restrictive corroborative particle, which, while never introducing a full, direct reason (as *quod* does) for a preceding statement, yet qualifies its application.

ENIM corroborates and appeals. *NAM* qualifies and corroborates.

PAUL O. BARENDT.

DE ORATORE, Lib. 1.—*ENIM* occurs 98 times: §§ 5, 7, 9, 16, 17, 31, 32, 34, 36, 37, 42, 45, 47, 48 (2), 51, 53, 54, 57, 59, 60, 62, 70, 74, 78, 81, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 95, 96, 97, 102, 104, 108, 112, 114, (twice) 115, 116, 117, 118 (twice), 120 (twice), 122, 125, 127, 128, 129 (twice), 130, 132 (twice), 133 (twice), 136, 137, 145 (twice) 146, 149, 150, 151, 161, 163, 164 (twice), 165, 167, 178, 186, 189, 190, 192 (twice), 194, 197, 199, 200, 202, 204, 208, 209, 215, 218, 220, 232, 243, 248, 255, 258, 259 (twice), 264, 265.

Enim occurs 7 times: §§ 20, 50, 56, 59, 69, 181, 235.

NAM occurs 39 times: §§ 2, 3, 4, 6, 14, 18, 28, 48, 52, 55, 91, 99, 108, 112, 113, 130, 131, 138, 145, 151, 173, 179, 185, 192, 201, 204, 205, 210, 214, 217, 229, 234, 236, 237, 238, 246, 247, 254, 257.

Namque occurs 3 times: §§ 71, 81, 101.

Lib. 2. *ENIM* occurs 172 times: §§ 10, 14, 15, 17, 18, 23, 24, 25, 28, 30, 31, 34 (twice), 38, 39 (thrice), 40, 43, 45 (twice), 47, 49, 51, 53, 55, 62, 66, 71 (twice), 72, 74, 76 (twice), 77, 78, 79 (thrice), 81 (twice), 84 (twice), 85, 88 (twice), 92, 99, 100 (thrice), 104, 105, 107, 108, 109, 112, 119, 121, 122, 124 (twice), 129, 130 (twice), 133, 134, 139, 140, 142, 143, 144, 146, 152, 157, 159, 160, 163, 173 (thrice), 174, 175, 178 (twice), 183 (twice), 184, 186, 187, 190 (twice), 191, 194, 195, 197, 202, 204 (twice), 207, 213, 214 (twice) 218, 219, 220 (twice), 221 (twice), 223 (twice), 224, 227, 229, 230, 232, 233, 235 (twice), 240, 242, 244,

246, 247, 251, 252, 254, 262, 264, 265, 268, 273, 278, 289, 290, 291 (twice), 294, 299, 300, 301, 302, 306, 308, 313, 314, 315, 319, 323, 329, 330, 333 (twice), 334, 336, 338, 340, 341, 343, 344 (thrice), 346, 350, 352, 357, 359, 360, 362, 363, 364 (twice), 365 (twice).

Enim occurs 10 times: §§ 5, 13, 32, 109, 218, 256, 301, 358, 361, 364.

NAM occurs 72 times: §§ 3, 8, 17, 21, 24, 25 (twice) 26, 30, 33, 36, 40, 41, 43, 48, 62, 76, 77, 82, 85, 88, 109, 110, 113, 118, 129, 131, 134, 137, 144, 151, 154, 157, 158, 166, 181, 192, 202, 205, 206, 208, 212, 213, 217, 220, 221, 222, 228, 230, 234, 236, 237, 249, 252, 257, 271, 277, 288, 291, 307, 310, 314, 315, 323, 325, 327, 330, 333, 334, 343, 361.

Lib. 3. *Namque* occurs 4 times: §§ 55, 122, 206, 331.

ENIM occurs 89 times: §§ 2, 3, 9 (twice), 10, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 36, 38, 41, 45, 46, 50, 51, 52 (twice), 54, 55, 63, 64, 66, 74, 75 (twice), 78, 79, 83, 84 (twice) 85, 86 (thrice), 87, 95, 97, 98, 102, 105, 106, 107, 110 (twice), 119, 121, 122, 125, 135, 140, 141, 144, 145 (twice), 148, 153, 154, 155, 161 (twice) 162, 163, 173 (twice), 176, 177, 181 (twice), 186, 191, 193, 195, 196, 197, 199, 208, 216, 217, 219, 221, 222, 223 (twice), 228, 230 (twice).

Enim occurs 5 times: §§ 18, 35, 165, 167, 185.

At enim occurs twice: §§ 47, 188.

NAM occurs 50 times: §§ 1, 7, 12, 16, 19, 22, 25, 37, 38, 41, 57, 61, 64, 67, 79, 80, 94, 96, 103, 110, 112, 113, 114, 116, 119, 124, 136, 137, 149, 155 (twice), 159, 161, 166, 176, 180, 182, 183, 184, 185, 192, 199, 202, 206, 211, 216, 221, 222, 224, 227.

Namque occurs 5 times: §§ 6, 72, 89, 126, 174.

DE OFFICIIS, Lib. 1.—*ENIM* occurs 111 times: §§ 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 (twice), 31, 32 (twice), 33 (twice), 37 (thrice), 38, 40, 42 (twice), 43, 44, 47, 49 (twice), 50 (twice), 53 (thrice), 55 (twice), 56, 62 (twice), 64 (twice), 67, 68, 71, 72, 74, 75 (thrice) 76, 77 (twice), 78, 82, 84, 85, 88, 89, 91, 93, 94 (thrice), 95, 97, 98, 100, 101, 102 (twice), 103 (twice), 105, 107, 110 (twice), 111, 112, 113, 114, 117, 120 (twice), 122, 124, 127, 129, 135, 137, 139 (twice), 140, 144, 146, 147 (twice), 148 (twice), 150 (thrice), 153, 154, 156, 159 and 160.

Enim occurs 4 times: §§ 48, 65, 153 and 160.

At enim occurs once § 144.

NAM occurs 31 times: §§ 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 23, 26, 28 (thrice), 32, 34, 42, 46, 48, 54, 67, 90, 94 (twice), 96, 99, 102, 115, 118, 119, 130, 142, 152, 155 and 158.

Lib. 2.—*ENIM* occurs 64 times: §§ 2, 3, 5, 7 (twice), 10, 12 (twice), 15, 16, 22 (twice), 23 (twice), 24, 25, 27 (twice), 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 42 (twice), 43, 48 (thrice), 50, 51, 52, 53, 54 (twice), 56, 58, 63 (twice) 64 (4 times) 66, 68 (twice), 69 (twice), 70, 71, 73, 74 (twice), 75, 77, 78, 79, 84 (twice), and 90.

Enim occurs 4 times: §§ 18, 24, 32 and 55.

NAM occurs 21 times: §§ 6, 14, 19, 30, 33, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 44, 47, 49, 51, 52, 59, 62, 65, 73, 79 and 88.

Lib. 3.—*ENIM* occurs 87 times §§ 2 (twice), 4, 6 (twice), 10, 14, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23, 28, 29 (twice), 30, 32, 34 (twice), 35, 36, 37 (thrice), 38, 39 (twice), 40, 41, 43 (twice), 46 (twice), 50, 55 (twice), 56, 57, 60, 63 (thrice), 65, 66, 68, 69 (twice), 71 (twice), 72, 73, 75, 77, 78, 80, 82, 83 (twice), 84, 86, 87, 89, 95, 98, 100 (twice), 101, 104 (twice), 105, 106, 107, 108 (thrice), 109, 110 (twice), 111, 113 (twice), 115, 117 (thrice), 118 (thrice), 120.

Enim occurs 6 times: §§ 13, 18, 24, 32, 63 and 74.

At enim occurs twice: §§ 79 and 105.

NAM occurs 32 times: §§ 1, 9, 11, 21, 22, 28, 30, 32, 40, 44, 45, 47, 55, 65, 70, 75, 82, 84, 97, 101, 104, 105, 106, 107, 110, 111, 113, 117 (thrice), 119 and 120.

LAELIUS.—ENIM occurs 100 times: §§ 3 (twice), 5, 6, 8, 9, 10 (twice), 11 (twice), 13, 14, 17, 18, 19 (thrice), 23 (twice), 26 (thrice), 28, 30 (twice), 31 (twice), 32 (twice), 34, 37, 40, 41, 45, 47 (thrice), 48 (twice), 49 (twice), 50 (twice), 51 (twice), 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59 (twice), 61, 62, 63, 64, 65 (4 times), 67, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74 (twice), 75, 76, 77 (twice), 80 (twice), 81, 85 (twice), 86, 87, 88, 90 (thrice), 91, 92 (twice), 93, 96, 98 (twice), 99 (twice), 100, (thrice), 102 (twice), 104.

NAM occurs 14 times: §§ 7, 17, 22, 26, 32, 33, 37, 41, 45, 82, 85, 88, 92, 104.

NAMQUE once: § 19.

CATO MAIOR.—ENIM occurs 71 times: §§ 1 (twice), 2, 3 (twice), 4 (thrice), 5, 7 (twice), 8, 10 (twice), 14 (thrice), 16, 19, 21, 24, 26, 27 (thrice), 28 (twice), 29, 31, 32, 35, 37, 38 (thrice), 39, 40, 42 (twice), 44, 45 (twice), 47, 51, 52, 55 (twice), 56, 57, 63 (twice), 65, 66, 67, 68, 69 (thrice), 70 (thrice), 74, 77, 79, 80, 81, 84 (thrice), 85, 86.

ENIM occurs 3 times §§ 15 (var, lect), 29 and 31.

NAM occurs 7 times: §§ 7, 11, 36 (twice), 55, 77, 86.

IN CATILINAM. 1.—ENIM occurs 8 times: §§ 4, 9, 13, 15, 16, 20, 22, 25.

ENIM occurs 4 times: §§ 6, 27, 29 and 31.

NAM occurs twice: §§ 3 and 12.

2. ENIM occurs 11 times: §§ 1, 7, 10, 11, 12, 17, 18 (thrice), 20, 25.

ETENIM occurs once: § 14.

NAM occurs twice: §§ 21 and 22.

3. ENIM occurs 5 times: §§ 3, 13, 23, 27 (twice).

ETENIM occurs 3 times: §§ 5, 21 and 24.

NAM occurs 6 times: §§ 2, 3, 11, 18, 19, 23.

4. ENIM occurs 11 times: §§ 8, 9, 11 (thrice), 14 (twice), 15, 16, 17, 20.

ETENIM, 4 times: §§ 2, 12, 17, 20.

NAM occurs 3 times: §§ 3 (twice) and 11.

PRO P. SULLA. ENIM occurs 31 times: §§ 2, 3 (twice), 4, 6, 8, 9 (twice), 10, 15, 18, 20, 25, 31 (twice), 40, 51, 53, 58, 69 (twice), 72, 76 (thrice), 79, 80, 88, 89, 90, 91.

ETENIM occurs 4 times: §§ 37, 39 (twice) and 69.

NAM occurs 6 times: §§ 3, 39 (twice), 41, 82, 88.

DIVINATIO IN Q. CAECILIUM. ENIM occurs 20 times: §§ 5, 23, 24 (2), 28, 30, 32, 36, 46, 47 (twice), 52 (thrice), 56, 57, 61, 63, 67 and 72.

ETENIM occurs 5 times: §§ 51, 60, 61, 64 and 65.

AT ENIM occurs twice: §§ 15, 22.

NAM occurs 8 times: §§ 4, 18, 22, 36, 54, 55 (twice) and 57.

IN C. VERREM PRIMA ACTIO. ENIM occurs 10 times: §§ 1, 2, 15 (twice), 20, 26, 32, 41, 44 and 46.

ETENIM occurs 4 times: §§ 10, 18, 20 (twice).

AT ENIM, occurs once: § 15.

NAM occurs 3 times: §§ 18, 29 and 35.

ON HORACE, ODES II. 17 and I. 20.

It is impossible that such emphatic language as (Odes ii. 17. 20-21)

utrumque nostrum incredibili modo
consentit astrum

can be justified by the explanation, 'I was nearly killed by a tree; you had a severe illness.' All men's careers are alike if escapes from death prove likeness. If Horace meant nothing more, he must have had a taste for petty coincidence equal to that of Mr. Peter Magnus. His destiny agreed with that of Maecenas in an incredible manner, and in proof thereof he mentions that Jupiter had saved Maecenas from the baleful influence of Saturn and that he himself owed his escape to Faunus. Verrall says that the connexion between the events was mystical and cannot be recovered; Wickham holds that the two events happened on the same day. It is enough that they happened on the same day of the year, in different years. Events can resemble each other in manner, place, and date. Resemblance of manner and place is clearly out of the question, and the coincidence must be one of date. The tenor of the ode is serious, and though Horace jests at the

NO. CXLI. VOL. XVI.

fashionable manufacture of horoscopes, he intimates that there may be something in it after all. Coincidence of date will account for the likeness of his fate to that of Maecenas, but why should Jupiter be given credit for saving Maecenas, and Faunus be said to have turned the stroke from Horace? Now in the construction of a horoscope the day of birth was most important. Horace tells us (Od. iv. 11. 16-21) that Maecenas was born on the Ides of April. In Ovid, Fasti iv. 621 we read

Occupat Apriles Idus cognomine Victor

Jupiter: hac illi sunt data templa die.

It would be appropriate for Maecenas' 'patron saint' to interfere on his behalf. In Tibullus ii. 5. 9-10 we find Jupiter Victor and Saturn mentioned together,

Qualem te memorant Saturno rege fugato
victori laudes conceinuisse Jovi,

and it is possible that this title of Jupiter suggested Saturn to Horace as the evil influence. Further, Horace was born on the 8th December. It may be that he ascribes praise to Faunus, because the

Faunalia were held on the 5th December (Odes iii. 18. 10),

'cum tibi Nonae redeunt Decembres.'

If, then, we accept the interpretation that the enthusiastic reception of Maecenas in the theatre, on his recovery from illness, and Horace's escape from the tree happened on the same day of the year, some light will be thrown on the well-known difficulty of Ode i. 20. It should be noticed that the lucky day in question was the 1st of March, as Horace states in Odes iii. 8

'Martis caelebs quid agam Kalendis?'

It seems to be agreed by the commentators that Ode i. 20 is an invitation to Maecenas to come and visit Horace in his Sabine home. This is merely a deduction from the mention of Sabine wine in the first line, and Horace only says that Maecenas must drink that wine with him that day. In all the Odes and Epodes we nowhere find any other invitation to drink such poor stuff as Sabine wine. In Od. i. 9 Horace is in his own house on a winter's night, and he bids Thaliarchus bring him up 'quadrimum Sabina merum diota.' But there is a great difference between drinking it by oneself and offering it to a friend and patron of high degree. Such a notorious *bon-vivant* as Maecenas would be the least likely of all men to receive such an invitation. Corvinus (Od. iii. 21. 1) is to have Massic wine as old as Horace himself; Phyllis (Od. iv. 11) shall have Alban wine; Tyndaris (Od. i. 17. 19) is actually invited to the Sabine farm, but is promised Lesbian wine. When Horace does invite Maecenas to his estate (Od. iii. 29) he assures him in the first stanza that the wine will be 'non ante verso lene merum cado.' Sabine wine was not 'lene.'

There must be some very special reason why Maecenas should drink 'vile Sabinum.' When Arthur Pendennis and the Major were invited to dinner at old Mr. Foker's house they had to drink a glass of 'plain porter,' though every luxury was on the table. Of course there was a special reason. Does not Horace give a reason? More than half the ode is taken up with the statement that Horace himself had bottled this Sabine wine on the day of Maecenas' visit to the theatre, when the enthusiasm over his recovery was so marked. If we ask when it would be appropriate and justifiable for Horace to invite Maecenas to drink that poor wine, only one answer is

possible. It must have been on the anniversary of that day. We find in Ode iii. 8 that Horace really does celebrate the anniversary of lucky days, and asks Maecenas to join him. It is the 1st of March, the day on which the tree fell, and he intends, with his friend, to celebrate royally 'hic dies anno redeunte festus,' quaffing bumpers all night long. But according to the interpretation of Od. ii. 17. 20. 21 Maecenas' recovery and Horace's escape happened on the same day of the year, if not the self-same day. So that Horace does keep the anniversary of the day 'datus in theatrum tibi plausus,' for a double reason; and in Ode i. 20 he asks Maecenas to come and celebrate the same anniversary as that mentioned in iii. 8.

Further, it is worth observing that in Ode iii. 8. 11 the wine Horace promises Maecenas was bottled 'consule Tullo.' We find that there was a L. Volcatius Tullus consul in B.C. 66, and another L. Volcatius Tullus consul in B.C. 33. The wine is always referred by the commentators to the former date. It seems strange that men in Rome four or five years after Tullus had been consul should be expected to pass over the consul whom they had seen and known, and cast their memories back nearly forty years. Moreover this ode (iii. 8) is dated by political allusions, as the commentators agree, to B.C. 29. Sabine wine (quadrimum merum) bottled in B.C. 33 would be just fit for drinking in B.C. 29. It is very likely then that the wine of Od. iii. 8 is that same 'vile Sabinum' of Od. i. 20 (observe how closely the words of iii. 8. 10 'corticeum adstrictum pice' fit the 'testa conditum levi' of i. 20). In this case there is sly malignity in Horace's adjuration (iii. 8. 13) 'drink a hundred glasses of it.'

From this interpretation it follows that i. 20 is a pleasant compliment to Maecenas, who is invited to drink wine with Horace on an anniversary memorable to both of them. If we read in line 9 'tum hibes,' on excellent authority, the ode runs thus: 'you must drink Sabine wine with me to-day, Maecenas. I bottled it myself the day on which the theatre acclaimed your restoration to health. After that you shall have Caecuban and Calenan; I don't keep Falernian or Formian.' Horace speaks of Caecuban in the same way (Epod. ix. 1), 'repostum Caecubum ad festos dies.' He seems to have had an aversion to Falernian wine. He calls it 'severum'; in Epp. i. 18. 91 he accuses it of causing 'nocturnos tepores'; and the only occasion on which

he represents himself as drinking it is in the orgy of Odes ii. 11. In the only other passage where he mentions wine from Formiae he says that he has not got any (iii. 16. 34).

In conclusion, in i. 20. 11 should not *pocula* be nominative to *temperant*, and the verse be read

‘*mea nec Falerni
temperant vites neque Formiani
pocula collis,*’

‘my cups do not mingle (or rather ‘qualify’) the vines either of the Falernian or Formian hill:’ Lewis and Short give a quotation from Florus of ‘mons Falernus’ i.e. Massicus.

ERNEST ENSOR.

THE NUMBER TWENTY-SEVEN IN ROMAN RITUAL.

THE following note may be taken as a postscript to my recent criticism of Wissowa's theory of a late and Sibylline origin of the Argean ritual (see *Classical Review* for March 1902).

H. Diels, in his *Sibyllinische Blätter*, pp. 37 foll., maintained that the number three and its multiples are specially connected with the cult of the dead and the Powers of the earth, and as such were specially favoured in the Sibylline oracles: and that the cube of three is a peculiarly mystic number used on extraordinary occasions (p. 42), and having a specially chthonic meaning (p. 43). Thus at Rome the number of the virgines who were concerned in piacula ordered by the Sibylline books was as a rule twenty-seven (though not invariably so, cf. Liv. 37. 3: Jul. Obseq. 100), and in Augustus' *Ludi Saeculares* the choirs of boys and girls who sang Horace's *Carmen* were each of them twenty-seven in number. This seems to be the only example of the number in organised Roman ritual; but in a note on pp. 43 and 44 Diels goes on to suggest that the Argean puppets, which *may* have been twenty-seven (though certainty on the point is unattainable) were probably the survival of a sacrifice of 27 Greek captives ordered by the decemviri after inspection of the Sibylline books in the third century B.C. This suggestion, as I have already pointed out, was taken up by Dr. Wissowa and pushed still further: for he maintains that Diels has for the first time taught us the real meaning of the number twenty-seven in Roman worship, i.e. that it is Sibylline and chthonic, and confidently concludes not only that the Argean puppets, but also the Argean sacella, being (as he assumes) twenty-seven in each case, were not early or Roman in origin, but late and Greek, owing their existence entirely to the Sibylline books. It is noticeable that this theory is now stated as a proved fact in Dr. Wissowa's

great work on the Roman religion, recently published in Iwan-Müller's series of Handbooks. (p. 355).

On this particular point of the Sibylline origin of the number twenty-seven as it thus appears in Roman ritual, I am no more convinced by Dr. Wissowa's arguments than on the others with which I recently dealt in this Review. The number three and its multiples seem to occur in the folklore of almost all peoples; in Greece and Italy they are by no means the exclusive property of the framers of oracles, nor specially connected with chthonic cults. Even a cursory glance at the ingenious poem of Ausonius on the number three (*Idyll. XI*, with the introductory letter to Symmachus) is enough to satisfy anyone of this. And in the ‘specially chthonic’ number twenty-seven we need see no wonderful meaning on which to base historical conjectures as to the date and origin of institutions.

I find in Varro, *de Re Rustica*, I. 2 *ad fin.* a popular charm for the gout, which Varro declares had long been well known in his family: it consists in repeating the following words *twenty-seven* times, ‘*Terra pestem teneto, salus hic maneto,*’ while you touch the earth, spit, and so on. Perhaps Dr. Wissowa will argue that there is something chthonic in this nonsense, but he will hardly attribute it to the influence of the Sibylline books. Surely it is likely enough that the numbers three, nine, and twenty-seven were all in the repertory of the magicians long before the Sibylline oracles were heard of. Thus for example the charm used by Circe in Ovid *Metam.* XIV. 56 is repeated *twenty-seven* times: ‘*obscurum verborum ambae novorum Ter novies carmen magico demurmurat ore.*’ Again, the nine-night week, which was common to the Romans and Celts (Rhys, *Celtic Mythology*, p. 360) must have become tripled at a very early period of Roman history into the *trinum nundinum*

or period of *twenty-seven* nights (see Mommsen, *Staatsrecht* III. 375 note and Chronol. 243): and though the first mention we have of it is in the *Senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus*, 186 B.C., even Diels (*op. cit.* p. 43) allows that it must have its origin 'in the oldest epoch of Roman history.'

Once more, the number three constantly meets us in the stamping dance of rustic peoples; it is natural to man in this form of dance, as Mr. W. H. Hadow has pointed out to me, in order to preserve the balance, and may be traced in the song and dance of the Arval Brethren (Henzen, *Acta. Fr. Arv.* p. 26), in the dance of the Salii, in that of Horace's *fossor* (*Od.* III. 18. 16) in the words *tripudium*, *tripodare*, *triumphus*, &c., and in the dance music of every people: I have myself been kept awake a whole night in an inn on the Italian side of the Alps by the constantly repeated *tripodatio*

of dancers celebrating the feast of their patron saint. Now I find in the *Tabulae Iguvinae* (Buecheler, *Umbrica* p. 133), which contain probably the oldest and purest religious ritual to which we have access in ancient Italy, a clear case of this threefold stamp *nine times repeated*. The words '*nuvis ahtrepudato*' can hardly be otherwise translated than into '*novies tripodato*.' In this case the number twenty-seven grows in the easiest way out of the natural tendency of man to stamp three times in the earliest forms of the dance in which he delights.

I maintain then that the number twenty-seven is not peculiarly Sibylline, and that if the Argean puppets were really of that number, it can be accounted for on other grounds, without ascribing to them a late and Sibylline origin.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

ON THE USE OF *NEQUE* AND *NEC* IN SILVER LATIN.

The writers of the Silver Age stand in marked contrast to those of the Golden Age in their attitude toward *neq.* Both in prose and in poetry a decided preference is manifested for the shorter form. The wider use of the negative particle, *neq.*, may have been influenced by the wider use of the connective, *ac*.¹ This preference for *ac* is shown by the fact in nine of the most important writers² of this period, *ac* is used 4264 times (70 per cent.) and *atque* only 1847 times (30 per cent.). Sen. Mai., e.g., shows his preference in a marked way, using *ac* 728 times to *atque* only 119; Tac., *ac* 893 times to *atque* 312; and Suet., *ac* 627 times to *atque* only 217. In poetry, however, we find a different condition of affairs prevailing. Here metrical considerations often have the deciding vote in determining the particular form to be used, and in this case the verdict

was in favour of *atque*, thereby reversing the decision of the prose writers. In nine of the principal poets of this period we find *atque* used 1132 times (61 per cent.) to *ac* only 735 times (39 per cent.) that is, *atque* in poetry = 61 per cent., in prose = 30 per cent. and in several of the poets the contrast is strongly marked, as, e.g. Val. Flac. uses *atque* 145 times to *ac* 79 times; Statius *atque* 222 to *ac* 107 times; Martial *atque* 59 times to *ac* once; and Juvenal *atque* 156 to *ac* 59 times. Seneca is the only poet to furnish an exception to the rule that *atque* is the poetical preference. He uses *atque* only 46 times, *ac* 109 times; but when it is taken into consideration that the larger part of his tragedies is written in the Iambic trimeter, which is closely allied to prose, the shift to the prosaic usage is explained.³ This tendency, for the prose writers to use *ac*, the poets *atque*, is exemplified in the usage of two earlier writers, Vergil and Livy. In the first six books of the *Aeneid* *atque* is used 95 times (64 per cent.) to *ac* 53 times (36 per cent.); on the contrary, Livy in xxi and xxii uses *ac* 213 times (67 per cent.) to *atque* 104 times (33 per cent.).

Nec, although parallel with *ac* in origin, being brought into existence by the same

¹ *ac*, according to the prevailing view (Stolz, *Formenlehre*, §§ 46 and 69; Hist. Gram. §§ 250, 353, 355; Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.* p. 598. Luc. Mueller, *De Re Metr.* p. 426, however, regards the *a* as long. We are without the light that metrical usage might throw upon the subject, as *ac* never occurs in any good poet before a vowel.

² For a list of the prose writers and poets, cf. under *neque enim*, p. 214. In making this investigation the writer made use of the latest Teubner texts, except for Quintilian (Meister), and Juvenal (Friedlaender), and text variants were noted. For Tacitus the lexicon of Gerber and Greef, and for Petronius that of Segebadé et Lommatzsch, were used.

³ Cf. further; 'The use of *atque* and *ac* in Silver Latin,' in *Studies in Honor of Professor Gildersleeve*, pp. 413-425.

forces, followed a different line in the course of its development. *Ac* was early put under certain restrictions, and, while writers of every period felt at liberty to use *nec* before vowels, the same privilege was not accorded to *ac*.¹ The use of *nec* before vowels, however, was also subject to certain limitations. As is known, it did not meet with the approval of Caesar, who avoided it entirely, while Cicero availed himself of the privilege only on rare occasions. The writers of the Silver Age felt differently about it. Quintilian, who always stood for high ideals, and preached Cicero in season and out of season, uses *nec* before vowels about 150 times. With this writer, as with others of the same period, the same word was not always treated in the same way. Before *immerito*, e.g., he uses *neque* 7 times and *nec* 8 times; in 5, 8, 5 but two lines separate *nec ulla* from *neque ulla*. The usage before the vowel *u* deserves particular attention. *Nec* is used before *ullo* in 4, 5, 26 and 9, 4, 7; before *usquam* in 7, 4, 23; before *umquam* in 4, 2, 104. Sen. phil., however, uses *neque ulla* but two times (Ira 2, 19, 5: Dial. 6, 22, 1), *nec ulla*, on the other hand 13 times; *neque umquam* but once (Dial. 12, 9, 4) to *nec umquam* 8 times. So also, Tac. uses *nec* before *u* 46 times.² Eskuche (Einl. Friedlaender's Juv. p. 59, says that the MSS. require *nec* before *u*, 'weil ein *q* vor *u* sich nicht sprechen lässt.' The solution of this question depends upon one's attitude toward Elision. If the final vowel is entirely suppressed,

Nec { before vowels = 37
 ,, cons. = 129

Petronius, as the other writers of this period, shows the same preference for *nec*: 166 to 49. In Tacitus the contrast is not so great, as he uses *nec* 506 times to *neque* 445 times. He uses *nec* before vowels 189 times.

II. *Neque* (nec) enim.

This formula deserves especial attention.

In *Prose* { *neque enim* = 344 (86 per cent.)
 nec enim = 52 (14 ,, ,,)

c of course represents the pronunciation, and, if spelling is to represent the sound, *nec* should always be written before *u*. But, as is well known, several eminent authorities maintain that the final vowel was only partially suppressed, which consideration, of course, alters the case.

As remarked above, the writers of the Silver Age were fond of *nec*. A striking illustration of this is the usage of one of the greatest stylists of the period, Seneca; in 7729 verses in his tragedies he uses *nec* with great frequency, but does not use *neque* at all. Other poets also show the same attitude toward these two particles. Lucan uses *nec* about 320 times, but *neque* only 21 times. *Nec* is very freely used in the following poets, while *neque* is rare: Val. Flac. uses *neque* only 31 times (7 before a cons., 23 before a vowel, once before *h*); Sil. Ital. only 14 times (*neque vos* 9,344; *neque tot*, 13, 80; *neque ego*, 17,357; and *neque enim* 11 times); Statius uses *neque* 47 times (26 before *enim*, all the rest before vowels exc. 2,549, in Theb. 1,371 G has *nec*, and in 4,149 Mueller reads *nec*); Martial uses *neque* 12 times (add to Luc. Mueller's list, Re Metr.² p. 504: 3, 50, 6; 7, 14, 7; 20, 1, and to Friedlaender's Index s.v. 3, 50, 6 and 11, 58, 7). Luc. Mueller says that Juvenal uses *nec* more than 160 times and *neque* 9 times, 'no more,' but I have been able to find but 7. The usage of Petronius, compiled from the Lex. of Segebade et Lommatsch, is as follows:

Neque { before vowels = 12.
 ,, cons. = 37.

According to Draeger, Hist. Synt. II.² p. 68, *nec enim* is found first in Ter. Heec. 834.³ It appears sporadically in the class. period,⁴ but is used more freely, owing to the preference for *nec* in all positions, during the Silver Age. The usage in general may be seen from the following table:

In *Poetry* { *neque enim* = 72 (73 per cent.)
 nec ,, = 27 (27 ,, ,,)

¹ It may be added, by way of explanation that while *nec* could easily arise before vowels from *neque*(e), *ac*, owing to the presence of the *t* before the *-que* could never in this situation get further than *acc* (as, e.g. *atque*(e) *illum*, etc., *acc*). This explains why *nec* might be used before vowels, while *ac* could not. (Frotscher (Quint. p. 262), however, would have it that it is the sound that settles the matter: '*Quis est enim, quin sentiat, ac angusta et nec angusta quantum sono differant. Meo certe sensu posterius altero tanto mollius indicandum videtur.*' This view

is hardly correct.

² Consonants were also similarly treated; Quint, says *ex duobus* 5 times to *ex* 8 times; with *contrario*, *E* 7 times (Neue Formenlehre, omits 7, 4, 9 and 10, 1, 19, and cites 5, 14, 4 where Halm and Meister read *vel contrario*); with *contrario* Seneca phil. uses *E* 11 times, but *ex* 4 times.

³ Here, however, Dziatzko reads: *neque enim*.

⁴ It may be noted here that Livy in the 3rd Decade uses *neque enim* 19 times to *nec enim* 6 times.

The detailed usage of the principal writers of this period may be seen from the following table:

PROSE.	NEQUE ENIM.	NEC ENIM.	POETRY.	NEQUE ENIM.	NEC ENIM.
Vell. Pat.	3	0	Phaedrus.	1	0
Val. Max.	5	0	Seneca.	0	0
Seneca.	{ Phil. = 41 } Epist. = 16 } 57	{ Phil. = 29 } Epist. = 8 } 37	Persius.	1	0
Petron.	7	3	Lucan.	11	4
Plin. Mai.	28	1	Val. Flacc.	14	2
Quint.	116	2	Sil. Ital.	11	7
Tacitus.	49	9	Statius.	26	12
Plin. Min.	72	0	Martial.	4	0
Suet.	7	0	Juvenal.	4	2
TOTAL.	344	52	TOTAL.	72	27

NOTES.

(1) *Nec enim* is very rare in prose except in Seneca, who shows an unusually large number of examples. The combination is entirely lacking in Vell., Val. Max., Plin. Min. and Suet. It is doubtful whether Plin. Mai. uses it at all, as in N. H. iii, 2, A r v read *nunc*.

(2) Quintilian's usage is noteworthy: *neque enim* 116 times to *nec enim* but two times. In view of the marked preference for *neque enim*,—how strongly marked the table shows—certain editors, as Spalding, have maintained that Quint. does not use *nec enim* at

all. The two passages concerned are 5, 9, 6 and 9, 3, 79. In both of these passages Halm and Meister read *nec enim*. For the first there are no MSS. variants, and to the second Halm adds: '*nec mei, neque edd.*' The fact that *nec enim* was used at least 52 times by the prose writers of this period, and the fact that his pupil Tac. used it 9 times, lends a certain support to the reading *nec enim* in these two passages.

(3) In poetry *nec enim* was not used at all by Phaedr., Sen., Pers., and Mart., while the preference for *neque enim* in Val. Flacc., Mart., is noteworthy.¹

III. *Nec* (= *ne . . . quidem*).

Riemann (Et. Tit. Liv.² p. 278) cites 7 examples of this usage from Livy. Later writers, especially Quintilian, used it more freely. This writer furnishes 21 examples, (Draeger's list, H.S.² p. 71 f. = the list of Hand Turs. IV. p. 109). Schmalz Lat. Synt.³ p. 455 omits Martial from his list of the writers using *nec* in this sense. Martial furnishes 7 examples (cf. Friedlaender ad XII, 97, 8 and add 5, 70, 6 and 6, 77, 1). Quint. uses *neque* in this sense 6, 1, 53; 9, 14, 7; 11, 3, 2 and 12, 10, 66; Tac. 6 times (H. 4, 80; Ann. 2, 82; 3, 29; 56; 15, 18; Dial. 8). Tac. also uses *nec* 5 times (G. 6; Ann. 11, 30; 12, 43; 14, 55 and Dial. 37); Juv. 3 times 2, 152; 3, 90; 14, 246. cf. also Petron. § 47 (H reads *ne*). *Nec* in this sense was frequently used by Lucifer Cagliari, Tert. and Cyprian (cf. Hartel, Arch. f. Lat. Lex. III. 26²).

¹ Draeger cites Apul. Met. 3, 8 for *nec enim*. To this add 5, 19; 29, and 31.

IV. *Nec dubie*.

This expression belongs to post-Classical usage and is very rare. According to Draeger Livy uses it only once (2, 23, 13). Quint. also uses it in 2, 14, 2 and 3, 4, 1. (He uses *non dubie* in 7, 2, 6; 9, 4, 67; and 11, 2, 1, and *haud dubie* in 1, 1, 4 and 10, 1, 85, while Livy uses the latter 26 times in the 3rd decade.)

V. *Nec . . . Neque*.

This combination is also very rare. I have noticed but two examples in Quintilian.

(a) each before a vowel, 8, 6, 64 *nec aliud . . . neque alio*.

(b) first before a consonant, second before a vowel, 1, 3, 10 *nec me . . . neque illum*.

Petronius 94 furnishes a different combination, *nec Gilon . . . neque ego*.

EMORY B. LEASE.

The College of the City of New York.

² *nec . . . quidem*, a very rare usage, was noticed in Quint. Decl. 331, 8 and 335, 11 (R).

REVIEWS.

BURNET'S *REPUBLIC OF PLATO*.

Platonis respublica. Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit JOANNES BURNET.

THE most interesting and important novelty in Professor Burnet's edition of the *Republic* is the value which he assigns to Vind. F, a MS. which Schneider was the first to use.

Of this MS. Schneider says: 'cum Ang. B Flor. R ex eodem fonte ductus—veterem vulgatam repraesentat, et fere cum Stobaeo, Eusebio, etc. consentit.' Elsewhere he observes that all three MSS. Ang. B, Flor. R and Vind. F are 'ex eodem fonte ducti et haud raro interpolati' (n. on 353A).

Professor Burnet's estimate is best given in his own words: 'hic igitur' (viz. in Vind. F) 'tenemus diu quaesitum antiquioris recensionis testem, deformatum quidem sicut Glaucum illum marinum, sed sincerum nec aliunde ut fit interpolatum. Quae res non est quod moneam quantum Platonis memoriae profutura sit: cum enim multis locis hic liber verum aut solus aut cum antiquis scriptoribus servavit, tum illud ex eo lucramur, ut novicios et interpolatos codices Venetum Ξ et Monacensem g abicere possimus, nisi si quando scribae non inruditi qui eos descripserunt felici coniectura in verum incidisse videntur.' 'I claim, therefore, for Vind. F that it, along with the "indirect tradition," gives us a second foundation for the Platonic text, coordinate with the archetype of ADM' (*Cl. Rev.* xvi. p. 100).¹ Ang. B is, says Professor Burnet 'demonstrably derived from Vind. F,' which is also, according to him, the source of Flor. R.

It will be observed that Professor Burnet puts the MS. on a much higher pedestal than Schneider. 'Vind. F is,' he says, 'sincerus nec aliunde ut fit interpolatus'; whereas Schneider considered the MS. 'haud raro interpolatus': 'multis locis verum aut solus aut cum antiquis scriptoribus servavit'—a view which Schneider certainly did not share, as we may see from the text he prints: it is the source of Ang. B and Flor. R, and not merely, as Schneider thought, 'ex eodem fonte ductus'; and finally, Professor Burnet goes so far as to coordinate it with

the archetype of A, D, and M, two of which MSS., A and D, are admitted by all to be of primary and fundamental value for the text of the *Republic*.

Whether Professor Burnet's estimate of this 'neglected MS.' will ultimately prevail or not, there can be no question that he has raised an issue of great importance, and students of Plato cannot be otherwise than grateful to him for rescuing Schneider's remarks on Vind. F from the oblivion into which they had fallen.

I have counted in all more than 80 cases in which Professor Burnet adopts a reading for which, in his *apparatus criticus*, he cites only F, and more than 40 for which he cites only F and one or more ancient writers who have quoted or paraphrased the passages concerned. About the value of these readings something will presently be said: meantime it should be observed that there are not more than 7 of these instances—7 at most out of more than 120—in which F is in point of fact our *only* MS. authority for the reading adopted by Professor Burnet.² In a considerable number of the readings for which F only is quoted, the reading of F is found also in Ξ or g or both; in many more Ang. B and Flor. R agree with F; and it sometimes happens that other MSS. have the same reading. The *apparatus criticus* of Professor Burnet's edition does not of course aim at completeness, and he is quite at liberty in such cases to adduce the evidence of F and F alone; but what of the sentence in the introduction 'multis locis hic liber verum aut solus aut cum antiquis scriptoribus servavit'? And what of the statement that 'in many places, F and the indirect tradition have alone preserved the true reading' (*Cl. Rev.* l. c.). I cannot help thinking that these remarks, coupled with the fact that F is the *only* MS. authority cited by the editor in such cases, are a little misleading, whether Professor Burnet can prove that Ang. B and Flor. R are derived from F or not. They certainly misled me.

² Of these seven readings, one is a correction ($\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ for $\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ in 472 A): the remainder include one which is certainly right (620 A), three which may be right but cannot be called certain (477 B, 490 C, 562 B), and two which in my opinion are wrong (456 A, 494 E).

¹ Ang. B = Bekker's ν ; Flor. R = Stallbaum's χ ; Burnet's D = Bekker's Π ; M is Campbell's Cesenas M.

I suppose that Professor Burnet has altogether discounted Ang. B and Flor. R, holding, as he does, that they are derived from F. Are they so derived? That all three MSS. belong to the same family is clear enough from Schneider's *apparatus*; but that F is the ancestor, and not the elder brother of the other two MSS., Professor Burnet has not yet, in my opinion, even approximately shewn. (Whichever of these alternatives is true, it is right that F, as the older member of the family, should henceforward be quoted rather than Ang. B for readings which are common to both. I am grateful to Prof. Burnet for pointing this out, and note the suggestion for future use.) In either case, it is clear from Schneider's *apparatus* that Ang. B is not a mere transcript of F, and so far as the evidence goes at present, even if we should allow that F is the father, it seems to me more reasonable to assign some of the discrepancies between Ang. B and F to the influence of an independent MS. tradition rather than to ascribe all of them to unauthorised correction or conjecture. In 495A nine, in 585B fifteen, in 621A nine, and in 621B five words are omitted by F: are they present in Ang. B? The answer, according to Bekker, is yes; and if they are present, Ang. B must have used at least *one* other MS. besides F, or else—and this seems to me the most probable supposition—Ang. B is derived, as Schneider thought, not from F, but from some common ancestor of both MSS.

These and similar attempts to affiliate extant MSS. to one another are interesting to most textual critics, and appear to have an extraordinary fascination for some students of Plato. Unfortunately, as I have elsewhere stated, and as has been abundantly shewn by others, Bekker's collations 'are sometimes wrong, and frequently incomplete': and it is surely indisputable that we must have trustworthy collations before we can securely affiliate our MSS. In the present instance, the true relationship between F, Ang. B and Flor. R cannot be determined until the last two MSS. have been completely recollated and compared throughout with F.

Meantime let us grant, for the sake of argument, that F represents 'the ancient vulgate,' and is, as I do not deny that it *may* be, the source of Ang. B and Flor. R. What bearing have these hypotheses on the question as to what Plato actually wrote in the *Republic*?

In order to answer this question satis-

factorily, it is desirable to call attention to one or two considerations of a wider and more general kind, which appear to be of primary importance for determining the text of Plato's dialogue.

Our authorities for this 'ancient vulgate,' according to Professor Burnet, are partly Vind. F, and partly citations of Plato in ancient writers, such as Stobaeus, Eusebius, etc. Side by side with the 'ancient vulgate' we have the tradition represented by Paris A and Ven. D. What is an editor to do when these two traditions disagree? In some cases it is easy to decide which of the two is wrong: but what of the large number of discrepancies where each of the two traditions has a reading which is grammatically right, and in other respects such that it *might* have been written by Plato? It is these cases which, as every editor knows, are often the most perplexing. In deciding these doubtful cases we ought, I hold, to consider first and foremost the *general* character of our witnesses, and allow most weight to those witnesses who are most uniformly intelligent, conscientious, and, as far as we can judge, truthful, just as we should do in deciding between conflicting evidence in any department of practical life. Other considerations have also some weight, but these are by far the most pertinent and important.

Now apply these principles to the case of the *Republic*.

Is Paris A, supplemented by D, or is Vind. F on the whole the more trustworthy MS.? If any one hesitates for a reply, let him print the MSS. as they stand in parallel columns, and I am sure that he will hesitate no longer. But it is urged that Vind. F is 'an entirely unsophisticated document,' and that 'although it is full of mistakes, yet they are not of the misleading kind, being due to ignorance and not to perverse ingenuity' (*Cl. Rev.* l. c.). Schneider, as I have said above, thought differently: but why do we praise accuracy and scholarship in a modern book and stigmatise them as sophistry in a MS.? Is an illiterate MS. necessarily more trustworthy than one which is written or revised by a scholar? We ought to remember that there is such a thing as a scholarly conscience, and that ignorance is apt to be itself the most dangerous of sophists. It is easy to carry the worship of the 'unsophisticated' too far: and Professor Burnet will himself allow that there is little, if anything, of the 'lying poet' in Paris A, whatever he may think about Ξ and ζ .

The case for A and D is still stronger if we compare their readings with those of ancient writers and commentators who quote the *Republic*. Compared with ancient quotations, Paris A, especially when corrected by D, is regarded as a whole, *νήφων παρ' εἰκὴ λέγοντας*. A glance at the *apparatus criticus* of Professor Burnet himself will prove this statement; and any one who chooses to study Schneider's *apparatus* will find proof piled upon proof.

I maintain therefore, that even if there was an 'ancient vulgate,' its general authority, judging by the only evidence of it which we possess, is inferior to that of the text represented for us by A and D. Some may be disposed to ask 'How is this possible?' It is said that 'our ninth century MSS.' (of which Paris A is one), 'represent a recension made possibly about the fifth century A.D.' (*Cl. Rev.* l. c. p. 100), and some of the writers who quote the 'ancient vulgate' lived before the fifth century.' I have never seen any real proof of the theory of a fifth century recension, of which I am glad to see that Professor Burnet speaks with caution: but even if the theory is true, the recension must itself have been based on some MS. or MSS., whose pedigree in turn reaches back to others and yet others, until at last the only true archetype is reached, I mean the *Republic* as it issued from the hands of Plato. The fact is that the popular hypothesis of 'archetypes,' unless it is discreetly used, is apt to become more of a hindrance than a help in the study of Plato's text. When an 'archetype' is once 'established,' a certain school of critics—I do not here allude to Professor Burnet—seem to suppose that the readings are once for all accounted for, and if a new reading is discovered from a source which is prior to the supposed 'archetype,' it is at once hailed as an earlier and therefore more authoritative reading than that of the 'archetype.' The discussion which raged over the papyri of Plato will illustrate my point. It seems to be sometimes forgotten that even an 'archetype' is *οὐκ ἀπαπτος*, and that it is *pedigree*, and not age, which counts. In manuscripts, if not in life, we should judge of the father by the children; and according to this standard, the 'ancient vulgate,' is not to be compared with the ancestry of Paris A and Ven. D.

Now if it is agreed that A with D is in general more trustworthy than the 'ancient vulgate,' so far as that is known to us, we are surely bound in the very large number of cases where A and the 'vulgate' each

have readings which are intrinsically free from objection, to trust the witness on whom we can usually depend, rather than the witness whom we have found to be much more frequently, and much more seriously, in error.

In my judgment, Professor Burnet has allowed much too little weight to this consideration, and has sometimes deserted A and D for F even where the reading of A is in itself, I will not say as good as, but much better than that of F. Thus in 344 ε he reads, with F and its relations, *ἡ σμικρόν οἶε ἐπιχειρεῖν πρᾶγμα διορίσθαι ὅλον βίον διαγωγῇν, ἢ ἂν διαγόμενος ἕκαστος ἡμῶν λυσιτελεσάτην ζωὴν ζῷη*; instead of the reading of A D M etc., *ἡ σμικρόν οἶε—διορίσθαι, ἀλλ' οὐ βίον διαγωγῇν* etc. Every one will admit that *ἀλλ' οὐ* is free from objection, (cf. 346 A, 352 D, 479 E), and I think most will hold it simpler, livelier, and in every way better than *ὅλον*. In 365 B the *ἐὰν μὴ καὶ* of F is preferred to the 'difficilior lectio' *ἐὰν καὶ μὴ* of A D M. This is a more debateable case, but I believe that a careful examination of the argument proves A right. About my third illustration there should be no doubt. In 408 A, A, D, and M read *αἱμ' ἐκμυζήσαντ' ἐπὶ τ' ἥπια φάρμακ' ἔπασσον*, a line which is adapted by Plato from *Il. iv.* 218 *αἱμ' ἐκμυζήσας ἐπ' ἀρ' ἥπια φάρμακα εἰδὼς | πάσσε* (said of Machaon only). The subject in Plato is 'the sons of Asclepius,' and *ἐκμυζήσαντ'* is, as Schneider pointed out long ago the plural of the indicative (aorist middle): ('the sons of Asclepius') wiped off the blood and 'etc. If the middle is objected to, it would be easy to write, as I once did, *αἱμ' ἐκμυζήσαν τ' ἐπὶ τ' ἥπια* etc., but the change is quite unnecessary. Professor Burnet however writes *αἱμ' ἐκμυζήσαντες ἐπ' ἥπια φάρμακ' ἔπασσον*, taking *ἐκμυζήσαντες* from F and *ἐπ'* (instead of *ἐπὶ τ'*) from a conjecture by Professor Bywater. To my mind, and Schneider also thought the same, it is clear that *ἐκμυζήσαντες* in F is a deliberate correction of *ἐκμυζήσαντ'*, which was erroneously supposed to be a dual participle: so that *Vind. F* is not always so 'unsophisticated' as Professor Burnet thinks. In 494 E, again, Professor Burnet writes *εἰσαισθάνηται* with F (alone, apparently, this time) in place of *εἰς αἰσθάνηται* (A D M). With Schneider, I believe *εἰς αἰσθάνηται* to be right, although it has often been doubted,—but in any case *εἰσαισθάνηται* is surely wrong. There are many other cases in which the readings adopted by Professor Burnet from *Vind. F* appear to me intrinsically much inferior to

those of A and D, and in a large number of instances, where there is little or nothing to choose between the two MSS. in point of merit, he follows F; so much so, indeed, that I think there is no edition of the *Republic* which so frequently throws A overboard in passages of this kind. For examples I may refer to the notes on 348 c (ἐπειδὴ γε for ἐπειδή), 352 A (ταῦτα ταῦτα for ταῦτα πάντα), 357 A (τε δὴ for τε), 362 D (ἐγὼ μὲν αὖ for ἐγὼ μὲν), 365 E (νόμων for λόγων: but cf. with Schneider 364 B, 366 E), 373 D (ἡ χώρα γε for ἡ χώρα), 373 E (πολεμήσομεν δὴ for πολεμήσομεν), 375 D (ἐννεοήκαμεν for ἐνοήσαμεν), 388 D (αὐτῷ τι for αὐτῷ), 392 C (περὶ γε ἀνθρώπων for περὶ ἀνθρώπων), 526 D (καὶ βραχύ for βραχύ). In all these passages and others which I have collected, Professor Burnet will hardly deny that the reading which he rejects could very well have been written by Plato, and for my own part the reading of A seems to me in each of these instances either equal to or better than that of F.

The same tendency to abandon A without (in my opinion) any reason shews itself in cases where the evidence of F conspires with that of one or more ancient quotations. See for example 345 E (τοὺς ὡς ἀληθῶς ἄρχοντας for τοὺς ἀληθῶς ἄρχοντας—but ἄρχοντας may be a participle), 353 D (οὐ ψυχῆς for ψυχῆς), 372 C (λάχανά γε for λάχανα), 375 B (ἀλλήλοισ τε for ἀλλήλοισ), 522 A (ἔθῃ for ἔφῃ—ἔθῃ seems to me quite wrong), 537 C (οἰκειότητός τε for οἰκειότητος) and many other passages, which any one who reads Professor Burnet's edition with Schneider in his hand, can easily discover for himself. In not a few instances—excluding those in which all or nearly all the editors of the *Republic* have set the example—Professor Burnet relies on ancient quotations even when reinforced by none of our MSS. at all, e.g. ἀποδράς for ἀποφυγών 329 C (but Plutarch apparently read ἀποφυγών, and the repetition has an appropriate stylistic effect), ἐπιεικέι <καὶ κοσμίῳ> 331 B, δοκῶ for δοκεῖ 368 D, δεινῶν τε for δεινῶν 430 B, καὶ ὅταν δέ for ὅταν δέ 436 E, τοιοῦτον [μέν] τι 443 C, ὄντα for παρόντα 515 A, and others, all of which will doubtless receive due consideration at the hands of scholars. I confess that none of them, except perhaps παρὰ πᾶν for παρ' ἅπαν in 514 A raises my opinion of the 'ancient vulgate.'

With regard to the MSS. Ξ and q, Professor Burnet thinks we may now dispense with them altogether 'nisi si quando scribae non ineruditi qui eos descripserunt felici coniectura in verum incidisse videntur.' Of course a few—a very few—of their conjec-

tures are right, and they should be quoted for these, just as we quote Stephanus for his; but we are on much surer ground with an entirely unsophisticated document like Vind. F.' 'It is antecedently improbable that where they, (Ξ and q) 'depart from the earlier MSS. of their own family, they rest on anything better than conjecture' (*Cl. Rev.* l.c. p. 101). Why is it antecedently improbable? Professor Burnet himself reminds us that 'both of them come from the very centre of Platonic study.' Surely that is a reason for thinking that their readings were selected with some care, and that more than one MS. of Plato went to their formation, just as in another centre of Platonic study, the University of Oxford, an editor of the *Republic* lays several MSS. under contribution, although he may build mainly on one. That the 'scribae non ineruditi' made conjectures in former days, as they do now, and sometimes in the most light-hearted way, as alas! they still do, is unfortunately only too certain, and no doubt Ξ and especially q, like nearly every modern edition, Professor Burnet's and my own included, have suffered from this cause: but until we know more about the conditions under which MSS. were produced, we have assuredly no right to maintain that those admittedly right readings of Ξ and q which are peculiar to these or to these and a few other extant MSS. are never based on earlier MS. authority. It is nothing but the modern *cacoethes affiliandi* which forces Platonic scholars into so absurdly untenable a position. But whatever view we may hold of the lineage of Ξ and q, or the learning of their scribes, Professor Burnet's own estimate of their value for an editor of the *Republic* is attested by the eloquent fact that in at least thirty-three places—all of them be it noted, passages where he finds no help in A, D, M, or F, he has recourse *volens volens* to Ξ or q or both of these MSS. together for the reading which he himself adopts. 'Of course a few,—a very few—of their conjectures are right.' Is not thirty-three a somewhat liberal allowance, if not for a 'few,' at all events for a 'very few'? And are all these readings due to 'perverse ingenuity'?

Apart from the tendency to the apotheosis of this 'Glaucus of the sea,' Professor Burnet's treatment of the text is on the whole conservative. Emendations are admitted with commendable caution, and excision is very rarely exercised. On difficult and disputed passages he frequently takes an independent line, and sometimes apparently acquiesces, as every editor of a text must do, in the

traditional reading and punctuation in default of anything better. I am glad that he has restored the MS. reading in 521 c, where I rashly changed it; but the passage is not yet sound, unless a comma is printed after ἀληθινῶν. In 515 b, Professor Burnet reads εἰ οὖν διαλέγεσθαι οἱ τ' εἰεν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, οὗ ταῦτα ἡγῆ ἂν τὰ ὄντα αὐτοὺς νομίζειν ὁρῶν; Instead of νομίζειν (the reading of F), Paris A and other MSS. have νομίζειν ὀνομάζειν, and in all the oldest MSS. παρόντα stands in place of ὄντα. Whatever else is clear about this passage, it is surely certain that ὀνομάζειν is genuine: else what is the point of εἰ οὖν διαλέγεσθαι οἱ τ' εἰεν?

There are of course many other passages in which many other Platonic scholars will differ from Professor Burnet, but his views always merit the most careful consideration, and frequently seem to bring to light important points which have not received sufficient attention at the hands of previous editors. His own emendations and suggestions on the text are tolerably numerous. I think the most plausible of those which I have observed are perhaps ἔστω for ἔστωσαν 352A (cf. 354A, where Stobaeus reads ἔστω), and οὐ δουλεύειν for αὐ δουλεύειν 444B (ought not the negative, however, to be μή?), but all of them are interesting and noteworthy. Misprints, etc., are rare: I have noticed the following: 341B ὁ for δ; 353A αν; 351B πολλας; 382E οὐδ' (text and notes); 390E δῶο'; 425B τὸ τοιάδε; 451A notes α6 for α7; 468A ἂν for αὐ; 524A ἐν γε; 565C notes ἕνα γε τινα. Is ἄνδρες for οἱ ἄνδρες in 556D correctly accented? Professor Burnet assigns this reading to myself, but in my edition I printed ἄνδρες. The following error is more serious. 'Considerable significance,' says Professor Burnet, 'must be attached to the fact that in *Rep.* 612d the reading of F (ex) and Stobaeus ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, κεκριμέναι εἰσὶν is given in the margin of Par. A by the first hand with the sign γρ, while in the text A has ἐπειδὴ ἦν τοίνυν κεκριμέναι εἰσὶν, ἐγώ with DM' (*Cl. Rev.* l. c.). It is true that ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, κεκριμέναι εἰσὶν appears in the margin of A (though the writing is not in my judgment by the first hand), but this is *not* the reading of Stobaeus and F(ex). Both Stobaeus (I. p. 402. 23 Hense) and F, etc. (according to Schneider,

whom Professor Burnet elsewhere follows) have ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, κεκριμέναι εἰσὶν, ἐγώ—*a* reading which is better than that which Professor Burnet ascribes to F because it retains the ἐγώ before πάλιν ἀπαιτῶ. But I think most scholars will agree with Schneider that ἦν δ' ἐγώ 'tam prope alterum ἐγώ valde insuave est,' and ascribe to Plato himself the reading ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν κεκριμέναι εἰσὶν, ἐγώ (with Flor. C). The ἦν after ἐπειδὴ in A and other MSS. is one of the easiest of orthographic errors: and the ἦν δ' ἐγώ of F, etc. is in my opinion only an attempt to correct that error, and justifies so far as it goes, Schneider's description of the codex as 'haud raro interpolatus.' In 612 c, where Professor Burnet reads ἡγείσθε with Paris A, I notice that he attributes to D the reading ἡγείσθε (*sic*). Apparently he has taken this from my edition, where by an unfortunate misprint ἡγείσθε is assigned to that MS. in the foot notes. In point of fact D has ἡγείσθε, as Jowett and Campbell correctly state.

It may also be mentioned here that ὁρθότερα is not, as Professor Burnet says, the reading of Paris A in 515d, but ὁρθότερον. This error dies hard; it still survives for example in Jowett and Campbell's edition. My own collation, made in 1891, gives ὁρθότερον, and M. Dorez, of the Paris Library, to whom I have written on the subject, has looked at the MS. again and found ὁρθότερον.

Professor Burnet has still the most arduous part of his task before him, and every student of Plato will wish him true success in grappling with the text of the *Laws* and the *Timaeus*. For my own part I think that no greater boon could be conferred on students of these two dialogues than a really trustworthy text, based on a new and accurate collation of Paris A, with a conspectus of various readings from other MSS., where A is wrong or obscure. Although I am unable to agree with Professor Burnet's critical method in his edition of the *Republic*, I gladly recognize that few living scholars are so well qualified to undertake such an edition of the *Timaeus* and the *Laws*: and nothing, in my opinion, will give the Oxford Plato so permanent a value in the history of Platonic scholarship as such a duty well and happily fulfilled.

J. ADAM.

BLAYDES ON EURIPIDES.

Adversaria Critica in Euripidem. Scripsit ac Collegit F. H. M. BLAYDES, M.A., LL.D. Halis Saxonum. 1901. 10 M.

It is some sixty years ago since the Rev. Dr. Blaydes published his first edition of a classical writer, namely an edition of a portion of Aristophanes. In 1859 he issued an edition of the trilogy of Sophocles in the *Bibliotheca Classica*; the rest of the plays were issued separately (and by another publisher) somewhere between 1870 and 1880. The Sophocles completed, Dr. Blaydes returned to his first love, and began a complete edition of Aristophanes on a large scale. It was completed in thirteen octavo volumes.

One would have imagined that such an output would have sufficed any ordinary editor; but Dr. Blaydes is not an ordinary editor, by any manner of means. Within the last decade we have had about ten volumes of '*Adversaria Critica*,' on the fragments of the Greek comic Poets, the Tragic fragments, on 'various Greek and Latin poets, complete editions of the Aeschylean trilogy; '*adversaria in Aristophanem, Sophoclem, Aeschylum*'; and last of all, a portly tome of nearly 600 pages of *adversaria upon Euripides*. No! not 'last of all'; for during the last few weeks another volume has appeared—'*Adversaria in Hero-*

dotum;' and a further volume '*Spicilegium Aeschyleum*' is announced as '*sub prelo*.' Shades of Porson and Dobree!

The present collection of notes and *adversaria* does not differ materially, in method—or the lack of it—from Dr. Blaydes' other volumes. There is a vast number of parallel passages—not all of them relevant—a great many wanton alterations of the text, introduced by 'qu.,' 'leg.,' 'malim,' and so forth, and a certain amount of exegetical material. All this material is thrown together without much regard to the first duty of an editor—careful revision; hence the book is somewhat of a '*rudis indigestaque moles*.' Dr. Blaydes sows with the sack; this besetting fault has never left him during his whole editorial career.

Still, when all is said and done, there is a mass of useful grain among the chaff; but it requires winnowing out. The book is curiously annoying in one particular; it scarcely ever notices recent editions, or the work of scholars in such publications as the *Journal of Philology* or the *Classical Review*. Even such well-known works as Dr. Sandys' edition of the *Bacchae*, or Dr. Verrall's *Medea*, appear unknown to Dr. Blaydes.

The present volume is dedicated to Prof. Robinson Ellis.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

WELLMANN'S FRAGMENTS OF THE GREEK PHYSICIANS.

Die Fragmentensammlung der Griechischen Aertze. Band I. Die Fragmente der Sikelischen Aertze Akron, Philistion, und des Diokles von Karystos. Herausgegeben von M. WELLMANN. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. 1901. Pp. 254. (Preis. M. 10).

THE comparative appreciation of the various writings of the *Corpus Hippocraticum* does not even yet make rapid or continuous progress, in spite of the admirable labours of Littré, Daremberg, Greenhill, Ilberg, Kühlewein, and others. The testimony even of Galen himself on this subject is hesitating and contradictory; it has been necessary therefore to rely on the somewhat

slippery ground of critical methods without definite testimony.

No little interest then was aroused in the subject by the discovery of the medical papyrus, now in the British Museum, described in this *Journal* by Mr. Kenyon in June 1892. This papyrus, dating not later than the Second Century A.D., is based in part upon Menon's compilation of Aristotelian notes: this part contains a large number of references to Greek medical writers; and if by means of these, or of any of them, certain extant treatises could be authentically attributed to particular authors a standard of comparison, now sadly wanting, would be supplied. Without repeating what I stated on this subject in

the Classical Review in 1898, I may say that to attribute, for example, even any one treatise of the Corpus definitely to Hippocrates himself would give us a 'point de prise' which now is wanting. Such and no less an attribution was boldly proclaimed by a recent critic,¹ and very startling would have been the results of the application of it to the Canon, had the apparent authorship stood the test of criticism. If this attribution were accepted it is not too much to say that on the one hand our conception of the genius of Hippocrates would, to say the least, be profoundly altered; and on the other hand that the current conceptions of the Greek Schools and their doctrines would be turned topsy-turvy.

The treatises of the Hippocratic scriptures are by no means congruous in doctrine; on the contrary they are very inconsistent, some of them even in polemical opposition. A few of these treatises we now regard as scientific in method, founded, that is, upon reason tempered by experience; and such we have been wont to attribute to the School of Cos, some of them indeed more or less directly to the Master himself. So firmly indeed was this opinion held that with modern physicians the phrase 'Hippocratic Method' became current to signify cautious induction from clinical observation, after the manner of our own Sydenham; as opposed not only to dogmatic or fantastic philosophizings and dialectics, but even to more sober use of logical and speculative thought. The School of Cos leaned to the former habit, that of Cnidos to the latter. To Hippocrates himself it is usual to attribute certain treatises which, combining breadth of view with close observation of Nature, seem to justify his claim to a place beside the greatest of the ancients.

If then it should suddenly appear that to Hippocrates must be assigned not merely a work of Cnidian cast, but one indeed of the most fantastic of a sophistical kind, it is evident that the bearer of this name must descend from his pedestal; that the works hitherto attributed to him must have been written by some other person, even more mythical than Homer. Furthermore it would soon appear that by such a criterion the whole Canon would have to be re-shuffled and re-distributed. Now from the more metaphysical, the more formalizing side of the Hippocratic Collection, such a particular work, the *Περὶ φύσων*, a treatise fanciful and

metaphysical beyond almost any of them, seemed in the Menonian Aristotle to be attributed to the great Hippocrates himself. Thus a confusion was set agoing; and voices were heard to declare that, contrary to all tradition of him, Hippocrates was a speculative, and even fantastic thinker: that he was indeed a forerunner of that Pneumatic School on the history of which, as set forth by Max Wellmann, I wrote a short notice in the 9th volume of this Journal (*C.R.* Vol. ix. p. 162, *et seq.*)

In the volume now before me, which forms the first of a new edition of the Fragments of the Greek Physicians, Max Wellmann presents us with the Fragments of Diocles of Carystos (fl. c. 400—350), and of the Sicilian physicians Akron, and Philistion. The volume contains also a chapter on the *Περὶ καρδίας* of the Hippocratic Collection, and one on a Tractate of Vindicianus, whose historical relation to Diocles, by way of Soranus, is made manifest by a careful comparison. I sincerely hope that the indisposition, to which the learned Editor attributes some delay in this work, is past; and that it may not interfere again with his admirable labours.

In this volume Wellmann relieves us, at any rate for the present, of turning the Hippocratic Canon inside out. He agrees with Diels (*Hermes* xxviii) and with Ilberg (*Phil. Woch.* 1897, f. 1153) that the Menonian Papyrus is in error; and that the *Περὶ φύσων*, although a part of the original Corpus, probably belongs as little to Hippocrates as any treatise in it can be said to do. Both by its style and its tendency indeed it is marked off from all the other treatises of the Collection, being a compromise between the teaching of the Sicilian physicians and that of Diogenes of Apollonia. Diels has supported the prevalent opinion that a collection, or Corpus, of the Hippocratic writings was in existence before the Menon-Aristotle; and that the *Περὶ φύσων* was contained in it—that is in the Fourth Century, not long after the time of Hippocrates. In support of this opinion the testimony of Diocles of Carystos is very important. Diocles, an eminent Athenian physician with some connection with the Sicilian School, who flourished between the time of Hippocrates and the rise of the school of Alexandria, was after Hippocrates the greatest physician of the period, and was known as *ἄλλος Ἱπποκράτης*; Pliny speaks of Diocles as standing next in renown to the great Hippocrates. Few of the writings of this century remained even

¹ Cf. 'Die geschichtliche Entwicklung d. sog. Hippokratischen Medicin in Lichte d. neuesten Forschung'; von Dr. Med. Spaet, Berlin, 1897.

in Galen's time; and little of their conditions of life; and among the few names of the disciples of Cos now known to us that of Diocles seems to be by far the most important. His *Περὶ παρασκευῆς ἀνατομικῆς* and *Περὶ ὑγιεινῶν*, and a work on the Diseases of women were most noted. Diocles seems to have been a learned and observant physician; but it appears to me, not in the case of Diocles only, that on the fall of Greek political freedom the value if not the activity of Greek thought altered greatly; it busied itself more and more with speculations on entities; and the sundry 'pneumatic' doctrines lurking in the Hippocratic writings sprang into dominance at the expense of the closer observation of nature.

Wellmann, by an ingenious and convincing comparison, finds a source for much of Diocles in the tract of Vindicianus, the importance of which he was fortunate enough to discover. Vindicianus was physician to the Emperor Valentinian, and in this essay he seems to have taken the work of Diocles, as handed down by Soranus of Ephesus, as his model. I see in Smith's *Dict. of Biog.* (Art. Vindicianus) the late Dr. Greenhill tells us that St. Augustine gives Vindicianus a high character for skill, wisdom, and learning. Putting together the known Fragments of Diocles and the Tract of Vindicianus, Wellmann concludes not only that the Hippocratic Collection existed in the time of Diocles, but also that Diocles may well have been himself the collector; and that in this sense he bore the name of ἄλλος Ἱπποκράτης after a more intimate fashion than we had supposed. Now internal evidence suggests that the 'sophistisches Machwerk' (the *Περὶ φυσῶν*) was the work of Diocles, and if this be the case the error of Menon in attributing this treatise to Hippocrates II. (the Great) is very ingeniously explained. Wellmann ends his chapter ironically enough, however, with the opinion that the 'creator of the Hippocratic

Corpus,' if such he were, seems to have known about as much or as little of the 'echten grossen Hippocrates' as we do.

In his second chapter Wellmann compares the doctrines of Diocles, of Philistion of Locri and of Acron of Agrigentum; and traces their dependence upon Empedocles; and so I may add, upon Pythagoras who was a sort of father of Greek medicine: he points out that one of the great distinctions between the Coan and the Sicilian Schools is in the seat of the soul (Seele), which the Coan School place in the brain, the Sicilian in the heart. Akron wrote *Περὶ τροφῆς ὑγιεινῶν* of which crumbs rather than fragments remain. The most interesting story we know of him is that during the plague he burnt fragrant woods both to purify the general air and to disinfect the patient himself. Philistion wrote on Surgery (Oribasius) and also on Diet. It is interesting to observe how from the earliest (Homeric) times all these Greek Schools kept clear of religious cult and strongly enforced the wise management of life.

In the chapter on the Hippocratic treatise *Περὶ καρδίας* Wellmann finds a close connection between the author of this work, the Fragments of Diocles, and Plato. He regards the *Περὶ καρδίας* as written under the influence of the Sicilian school, and especially of Philistion; and notes that in its correctness of human anatomy it supports the belief that in its regard for anatomy the Sicilian School followed that of Alcmaeon of Crotona.

Of the technical scholarship of this instalment of the edition of the Greek medical Fragments I am no adequate judge; but speaking as a physician and, more or less, as a historian, I may be permitted to express the great interest I have found in reading it, and in the manner in which Max Wellmann has dealt with materials of much importance in these respects. I hope the future volumes of the series may be no less interesting and no less skilfully edited.

T. CLIFFORD ALLBUTT.

KONSTANTINIDES' GREEK LEXICON.

Liddell and Scott in Modern Greek: Μέγα Λεξικὸν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Γλώσσης Ἀνέστη Κωνσταντινίδου. τόμος πρῶτος A, B, Γ, Δ, σελ. xxxii. + 669.

THE auspicious appearance of such monumental dictionaries as the *Historical English*

Dictionary and the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* now in progress, have raised such reasonable claims to a worthy compeer for the Greek language, that no ordinary lexicon, however copious and elaborate, can any longer satisfy the legitimate longings of earnest Greek students. For whereas they

are already provided with several excellent and more or less comprehensive dictionaries of archaeology, history, geography, and the like, the possession of an exhaustive Greek lexicon is still a pium desiderium which is not likely to be realised in the near future. So meanwhile we must be content with the current and time-honoured 'hand-lexica,' such as our Liddell and Scott, Passow (1841-57), Pape (1880), Jacobitz and Seiler (3rd ed. 1880), Suhle and Schneidewin (1875), and the like. For my part, every time I consult one or more of these dictionaries I close them with a feeling of misgiving if I am unable to check the information derived from them, especially in the numerous cases where the interpretation is manifestly forced into agreement with some fanciful etymology or grammatical theory, however authoritative or popular. This somewhat exaggerated caution on my part is justified not only by sad experience, but also by the consideration that no lexicon, however recent or esteemed, is a really independent work. Indeed the lexicographer has not yet been born who could have both the courage and life long enough to collect the huge material of the Greek language, and to trace critically the history and usage of every individual word, by examining and sifting the original sources. As matters now stand, every 'new' lexicon is based upon previous lexica, and the latest production, while correcting many previous errors, is bound to reproduce or inherit many more sins, and to add a fresh number of its own. We must also remember that as the study of Greek was, down to recent times, restricted to a select number of 'classical' poets and writers, Greek lexicography, which has always been guided primarily by the interests of schools and colleges, has paid especial regard to the vocabulary of the said classical texts, and only admitted, by way of toleration, such additions and curiosities from extra-classical and late texts as could be conveniently scraped from a few sporadic indices. If we further consider that all our lexicographers were unacquainted with the vast vocabulary and the peculiar orthography exhibited in the inscriptions, papyri, and new MSS recovered within the last thirty years, we shall realise upon how insufficient and unsifted material our current Greek lexica are founded. Not only words by the thousand and meanings by the hundred await incorporation and treatment, but the very orthography and inflexion of the words already embodied require a thorough revision.

Thus, to give only a few familiar illustrations, the letters *F* and *Q* have not yet found a place in the lexicon, so that all words provided with these symbols have no existence, e.g. *Foikos*, *Fēpos*, *Fika*, *Fēkastos*, *Fpḗis*, *κλέφος*, *Férwon*, *áfotos*, *ópotos*, etc., *Qópw*, *Qópaξ*, *γλανQῶπις*, etc. In the same way our lexica ignore or condemn such forms as *ῖός*, *μεικτός*, *μείγνυμι*, *οἰκίρω*, *κληδίον*, *θνήσκω*, *ἀμαξήπους*, *γεισήπους*, *συβίνη*, *Λεωντίς*, *Μοννιχίων*, *Σίβιλλα*, *Ἀλκμεωνίδης*, *Ποτειδεάτης*, *ἀλείζων*, *ποιεῖν*, *ποητής*, *ἀρην*, *κάτροπτον*, *ἐνψόδιον* (= *ἐνψώνιον*), *Βάχχος*, *εἰ* (= *ἦ* i.e. *ἀρα* and *ὄντως*) and *εἰ μήν* (= *ἦ μήν*), *ἐραυνάω*, *ἐατοῦ*, *ἀτός*, *ἡμυσυ*, *ἡμωβέλειν*, *παγκράτιν*, *ὥς* (= *εὖς*), *χαριστήριον*, *στάδον*, *ἡμισος*; *ἵνα* for *ἀγε* (*let*), for *ὥστε*, for *ὥς* or *εἴθε* (*utinam*), and for *ὅτι* (*because*); *μικρός* (= *νεώτερος*), direct interrogative *ὅ, τι* or *ὅτι*; (*what?*), *λοιπόν* (= *οὖν*), *ταχύ* *ταχύ*, *ἦδη* *ἦδη* (*jam jam*), *σιγῇ* *σιγῇ*, etc, etc.

However, as our prospects, of a thoroughly new Greek thesaurus are still remote, we must be grateful for any enlarged or revised edition of such current 'hand-lexica' as our Liddell and Scott, Pape, or Passow. We are, therefore, glad to hear that such a scholar as Dr. W. Crönert is now engaged in the preparation of a Passow, and that in this heavy task he intends to embody the rich crop of lexical material accumulated within the last half century through the inscriptions papyri and MSS, and still scattered in numerous inaccessible publications. Nothing but sincere praise and gratitude will be due to Dr. Crönert for his heroic task, though many of us would feel more confident if the work were founded upon our Liddell and Scott, which is, after all, a revised and greatly improved edition of its German parent, Passow, and so offers superior advantages in every other point except in accentuation. Be it as it may, a lexicon elaborated after Dr. Crönert's prospectus will no doubt be a great gain to classical scholarship, but in order to make it a real boon to students I would suggest that Dr. Crönert should secure the assistance of at least one more industrious collaborator who would sift and verify the material already contained in the present Passow. For, as is well known, the great Passow (1841-57) is founded upon the Lexicon of Jo. Schneider (3rd ed. 1819-21)¹ while Schneider rests upon

¹ Curiously enough the earliest translation and revision of Schneider's Lexicon (1804) was made by *Ἀνθίμος Γαζής*, a most learned Greek monk who issued it at Venice in 1809-12 in three large volumes in quarto. This *Λεξικὸν Ἑλληνικόν* is still a mine of valuable and original information, especially with

the old Stephanus (1572) and his dishonest corrector and plagiarist Jo. Scapula. This being so, a mere enlargement, however copious, of the existing Passow, is sure to perpetuate many of the errors and sins of its successive predecessors, which predecessors grew up in times and conditions less exacting than is the case with critical scholarship and textual criticism in our days. Wishing then Dr. Crönert health and strength for his Herculean labours, we look forward to the year 1905 when the first part of his new Passow is expected to make its appearance.

Meanwhile it is refreshing to see that another Greek lexicon, similar in character but more modest in compass, is already being issued in Athens, and this work though intended primarily for the Greeks, is sure to prove useful also to scholars of other nationalities, as the language used therein can easily be understood by any Greek student. This new 'Ελληνικὸν λεξικὸν is our Liddell and Scott carefully translated into modern Greek, and truly revised, that is largely corrected and enlarged. This is a distinct gain to Greek scholarship, and we compliment both editors and publishers on their great courage in undertaking an adventure of this magnitude, which they know full well will bring them neither great profit nor great fame in such a small country as Greece. Originally translated into modern Greek by Μόσχος, the work was declined by several publishers until the late 'Αλέξης Κωνσταντινίδης—a most acute and enterprising man, certainly the most remarkable publisher of Greece—realised the great value of the offer and undertook its publication. The enlightened publisher having been suddenly called away, his enterprising sons realising the great difficulty and responsibility of the task wisely decided to secure the editorship of Μιχαὴλ Κωνσταντινίδης of Κύζικος, an excellent Greek scholar, who, having taught Greek over twenty years in London and translated several scholarly works from English into modern Greek possesses a thorough knowledge of both Greek and English. This very industrious and conscientious editor, in order to attain greater accuracy and thoroughness, sought and obtained the friendly assistance of several eminent Hellenists in Athens, besides the

regard to Patristic and Byzantine Greek. As it covers the whole history of the Greek language, it is still highly and justly esteemed in Greece, despite the appearance in recent years of other rival 'Ελληνικά λεξικά, e.g. one by Βυζάντιος (1852, after the latest Stephanus), another by Σακελλάριος (1898, after Pape), and an 'Επίτομον λεξικὸν by the present reviewer (1891, after Liddell and Scott).

active co-operation of Prof. A. Οικονόμου, a shrewd and critical scholar who lectures on archaeology in the National University of Greece. Among the voluntary contributors outside the staff, the name of Prof. K. Κόντος deserves especial mention, because after and next to Κοραΐς, Prof. Κόντος—Cobet's most brilliant pupil—is indisputably the greatest classical scholar of modern Greece, the founder and leader of critical and accurate scholarship in that country, a man whose name is deeply revered though also loudly abused in his own country.¹

The first part already before us opens, by way of introduction, with a concise and lucid survey of the history of the Greek language, written by the eminent philologist, Professor Γ. Χατζηδάκης; then follows A. Autenrieth's short history of Greek lexicography, translated into easy and fluent Modern Greek from I. v. Müller's *Handbuch der Klassischen Alterthumswissenschaften* (vol. ii.) by Professor Γ. Σωτηριάδης, a man of wide learning. After these introductory essays, follows Liddell and Scott's comprehensive list of Authors in alphabetic order, which list, by a curious slip is mistranslated χρονολογικὸς πίναξ. Here the Greek editor might have improved his πίναξ by inserting such names as that of Hero(n)das and the fictitious Hermes Trismegistos so often quoted in the Lexicon, or by correcting the date or floruit of many an author such as Choiroboskos, Crates, Ctesias, Hippocrates, Lesbonax, Plato Comicus, Simonides Ceius, and others so sadly misdated in the original.

As to the text proper, the part before us contains the first four letters (ΑΒΓΔ) in a space of 670 pp. as against the 400 pp. of the original English, so that, when completed, this modern Greek Liddell and Scott will fill no less than 3000 pp. against the 1775 of the original. This enormous increase in the bulk of the book is of course due primarily to the polysyllabic nature of the Greek words as compared with their commonly monosyllabic equivalents in English (cp. ἄνθρωπος-man, βασιλεὺς-king, περιπατῶ-walk, οὐρανός-sky, ἔρχομαι-come, etc.), but largely also to the new material embodied in the Lexicon. It is only a matter of regret and surprise that the editors have not laid under larger contribution the inscriptional material already indexed in various volumes, and that even such hand-books as the Greek

¹ Classical scholars will hear with genuine regret and sympathy that Prof. Κόντος is threatened with total blindness, though his prodigious memory and critical acumen—he is a veritable walking library—enable him still to lecture and pursue in a way his literary studies.

grammars of Meisterhans, Brugmann, and G. Meyer have been overlooked. Even so, however, this modern Greek Liddell and Scott marks a distinct progress in Greek lexicography. A cursory comparison of the English original with its Greek edition will show that the latter, in the letter A alone, has been enriched by no less than 1000 new words, compiled from Hesychios, Baechylides, then from inscriptional and other sources. To begin with the first page, while the English original shows twenty entries between *a* and *άα*, its Greek representative numbers no less than forty, the new insertions being (leaving out their individual interpretation to save space): *άα* (ή), *άαβακτος*, *άαδα* *άαδών*, *άαδώνη*, *άαδής*, *άαθι*, *άαθικτος*, *άακιδωτον*, *άακραγής*, *άακτος*, *άάλιον*, *άάμιν*, *άανάμα*, *άάνδιχα*, *άάνης*, *άάρης*, *άάστω*, *άάστονος*, *άάταλος*. True these and most of the other numerous entries are largely solitary glosses compiled from Hesychios, thus being chiefly dialectal words which hardly occur in classical writers, but in a lexicon not intended exclusively for schools, all words are equally important, and an earnest student is likely to consult his lexicon in the case rather of a rare term than of a common word. Likewise in p. 20 the original has been enriched by the following entries:—

άδειλιος, *άδειματος*, *άδειος*, *άδεισία*, *άδεισι-βόας* (Βακχ.), *άδελφίδες*, *άδελφιδεύς* (inscr.), *άδέλφιον*, *άδελφογαμέω*, *άδελφογαμία*, *άδελφοζωία*, *άδελφότης*, *άδελφότης* (an epithet of James the brother of the Lord), *άδελφοκοιτία*, *άδελφοποιέω* (misplaced in L and S), *άδέματος*, *άδέσμευτος*, *άδετοχίτων*, *άδέτως*, *άδένεμβα*, *άδεινόν*, *άδη*, *άδημα*, *άδημίν*.

Then p. 329:—

δειλοκάριος, *δειλοκαταφρονήτης*, *δειλομαι* (= *βούλομαι* inscr.), (*δειλόφθονος*), *δειματηρός*, *δειματοποιός*, *δεινίας*, *δεινοεπής*, *δεινολόγος*, *δανόμορφος*, *-παθής*, *-πάθης*, *-πενθής*, *-πενθέω*, *-ποίησις*.

But while readers of dialectal and late Greek will be thankful for these and all other numerous additions to the Lexicon, students of classical Greek will be glad to find that every page bears the marks of *revision and improvement*: not only a great number of errors, still grievously marring the English original, have been corrected, but many an article has received valuable additions and elucidations. Thus L. and S. (Liddell and Scott, eighth ed.) says s.r. *άγγούριον*, τὸ, 'a water-melon,' whereas every Greek understands 'a cucumber.' *άκολπος*: L. and S. 'without bay or gulf,' which now K. (*Κωνσταντινίδης*) alters to 'without bosom i.e.

stomach.¹ *άλογόθετος* is not 'of which no account is given': but 'of which there is no question, unquestionable.' *άμετάφραστος*, L. and S. 'not to be interpreted, Hesych.'; K. 'that cannot be expressed by another term, untranslatable, Photii Lex. s.v. *τύπας*, Hesych. s.v. *θρίττε*.' *άμφίλαλος*, not 'chattering incessantly; *χείλη* Ar. Ran. 678': but 'talking in two tongues, and, mixing foreign words with Greek, of Cleophon whose mother was a Thracian, *χείλεσιν άμφιλάλοις*, *Άριστοφ. Βατρ.* 678.' *άμφίστομος*: L. and S. 'Antiph.' *Σφιγγ.* K. 'Εύβουλος' *έν Σφιγγοκαρίωνι*. *άμφιφών* not a cake 'offered by torch-light' to Munychian Artemis, Pherecr.: but a cake offered 'between two lights, i.e. between sunset and sunrise,' cp. *άμφιφώς ούρανοῦ*, *Άθήν.* 645 C. ' *άνάσσειν* not a sacrifice,' but 'a victim' (*ιεράιον*, *σφίγιον*, *θύμα*). *άνελίσσω*: not 'Ep. and Att. *άνειλ*—': but 'Epic and Ionic *άνειλ*—'. *άνεμώδης* 2 L. and S. 'vain, idle,' referring to Plut. 2, 967 B, but there Plut. speaks of an *άνεμώδης άκρωτήριον*, a promontory 'exposed to the winds.' *άνεύφραγτος* L. and S. incorrectly 'not rejoicing, joyless,' for 'giving no pleasure' (*μή προξενών ήδονήν*). *άντισοφιστεύω*: *άντισόφενμα*, K. 'άντισοφίστευμα' *άντιστατικός*: 'so *άνίστατος*,' K. so ' *άντίστατος*.' *άπαμφιέννυμι*: *Xenarch.* *Πλουτ.* 1, 5: K. 'Ξεναρχ. *έν Πεντάθλω*.' *άπάνενθε* and before 'consonants' (read 'vowels') -θεν. *άπαξ* II. c. 6 not 'id' (i.e. *Amphis*) but Ar. (i.e. *Άριστοφάνης*) *άπατιμάω*: the example 'οὔ μιν άτιμήσειε θεή' should be inserted under *άτιμάω*. *άπλατος*: for ' *όφης*, *Τύφων* Pind. P. 12, 15, etc. read *άπλάτοις όφίων κεφαλαίς*... ' *άπλατον*... *Τυφών*' (i.e. *Τυφώνα*) Pind. Fr. 93.' *άποδιπλόμαι*: not 'to be doubled' but 'to be unfolded.' *άποίητος* III. not 'of persons awkward, Geop.,' but 'of things or lands unfit, ή γάρ πυρρά γή είς τούτο άποίητος: έκκαίει γάρ τὰ στελέχη. Geop. 72, 12.' *άποκάθαρμα* II. not 'an expiatory offering,' but dirty water, 'slops,' *άπομηνίω*: not 'having departed from wrath,' but 'having waxed wroth or angry.' *άποπετάννυμι*: not 'to spread out all ways,' but 'to lift up, to remove.' *άποπίνω*: not, 'to drink up, to drink off,' (Hdt. 4, 70), but 'to drink out of.' *άποφλέω* and *άπόφλω*: not 'to owe, Byz.' but 'to pay off, *έχεις τὸ*

¹ L. and S.'s error may be due to a misunderstanding of Passow's definition (s.v.) 'ohne Einbug.' But in the passage referred to (Ael. H. A. 15, 16) there is question of the garfish: *θαλάττιοι βελόναί εκκοποί τε ούσαι καί λεπταί* i.e. having no crook or cavity.

χρέος ἄπαν σοι ἀποφληθὲν τελέως, Tzetz. Hist. 13, 614.' ἀπραγματεύτος: III. not 'highly wrought, inartificial,' but 'easily procured.' ἀραχνοῦ φής: not 'spun by spiders,' but 'fine as a spider's web.' ἀρματηγός: not 'driving a chariot,' but 'be longing to a chariot,' διὰ τῶν ἀρματηγῶν τροχὸν μὴ διεῖναι τὰς περόνας, Parthen. 6, 3. αὐτόκριτος: not 'self-condemned' but 'self-explaining.' ἀφορτος: for 'not burdened,' read 'not vulgar, polished.'

Another welcome feature of the volume before us consists in the correction of numerous references, and in the enrichment or expansion of many an entry by consulting or even reproducing, the very passage of the author, merely referred to in L. and S. Improvements of this kind we have noticed in almost every page, notably s.vv. ἀγάπη, ἀγίασμα, ἀγιασμός, ἀζηλότυπος, Αἴας, Αἰγᾶθεν, ἀθεώρητος ii., ἄλευρον, ἄλθεξις, ἀμυρός ii., ἀμεταχείριστος, ἀμτροχίτωνες, ἀμφίς B. ii., ἀμφίστομος, ἀνάθεμα, ἀνακίρναμαι, ἀναπαύω ii., ἀναφέρω i. and ii., ἀναφορά, ἀνδρόθεν, ἀνεπιστήμων, ἀνεκτικός, ἀνθῆω ii., ἀνθητικός, ἀνθινος, ἀνίημι 2, ἀνόητος 2, ἀνοργαστος, ἀντανάκλασις, ἀντί sub fine, ἀντίφορτος, ἀντιάζω, ἀντικαθίστημι ii., ἀντίπορθμος, ἀντιστρεπτός, ἀντιστρέφω 2, ἀντιφορτίζω ii., ἀντιχορδος, ἀντλία, ἀντομαι, ἀπαξ ii., Ἀπατούρια ἀποκίνησις, ἀπολαγχάνω 2, ἀποθρώσκω ii. 2, ἀποτυρώω, Ἀργαδᾶς, ἀρχαιολόγος, αὔετος, αὐλών, ἀμπελομίστια, etc.

As a matter of course, the numerous accentual mistakes and other misprints which sorely and unaccountably disfigure every page of our English Liddell and Scott are tacitly removed from its Greek edition, and so we now read s.v. αἵματωπός Eur. Phoen. 870. not δερμάτων, but δεργμάτων; ἀνασφύζω Soph. El. 1133, not φόβον but φόνου. ἀπολυτρώω: Plat. Legg. 619A not 'ἀπ- τῶν μακροτάτων λύτρων', but 'ἀπ- τῶν μαρο- τᾶτων λύτρων.' ἀνατέλλω: Aesch. Fr. 304, not Δημητρός ἀνατέλλει σταχύν' but Δημητρός- στάχυν. ἀρητήρ: not ῆ but ῥ. ἀστήρ: not 'ἀστρασι' but 'ἀστράσι.' ἀστράγαλος IV: not 'πεταλίζεν' but 'πεντέλιθοι.' The remaining accentual errors now tacitly corrected are too multitudinous to be enumerated here, but possessors of this 'Ἑλληνικὸν Λεξικὸν will find that very few accentual errors have escaped the eye of the editors, e.g. ἀγαθοδοσίς, ἴδος, for -δοσίς, ἴδος.

So far then, a Θεσαυρὸς τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Γλώσσης, or, at least, a comprehensive and accurate Greek Lexicon, is still a pium desiderium. But if German scholars take pride in their Passow, and British and American students are well-pleased with possessing a superior Passow in their Liddell and Scott, Greeks may be congratulated on acquiring a surpassing Liddell and Scott.

A. N. JANNARIS.

The University,
St. Andrews, N.B.

SOME RECENT AMERICAN WORK IN LATIN GRAMMAR.

The Subjunctive Substantive clauses in Plautus not including indirect Questions. By CHARLES L. DURHAM. Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, No. xiii. The Macmillan Company, 1901. Pp. vi. 120. Price 80 cents.

The Stipulative Subjunctive in Latin. By Prof. CHARLES E. BENNETT, Cornell University. Transactions of the American Philological Association (Ginn & Co.) for 1900, pp. 223-250.

A Study in Case Rivalry being an Investigation regarding the use of the Genitive and the Accusative in Latin with Verbs of Remembering and Forgetting. By CLINTON L. BABCOCK. Cornell Studies, xiv. The Macmillan Co. 1901. Pp. vi. 120. Price 60 cents.

The Case constructions after the Comparative in Latin. By K. P. R. NEVILLE. Cor-

nell Studies, xv. The Macmillan Co. 1901. Pp. 87. Price 80 cents.

The Latin Pronouns is, hic, iste, ipse. By CLARENCE LINTON MEADER, Ph.D. Instructor in Latin in the University of Michigan. The Macmillan Co. New York; Macmillans. London. 1901. Pp. xvi. 222. Price \$1.40 c.

MR. DURHAM states his aims as follows (pp. 2, 3):—

Taking the original force of the subjunctive to be that of 'will' or 'determination,' showing itself in the first person as 'determined resolution' and in the second and third persons as 'jussive,' and that of the optative mood to be first 'wish,' and secondly 'contingent futurity,' (the 'should'-'would' idea), I shall endeavor to show that the subordinate subjunctives in the substantive clauses in the extant plays and fragments of Plautus can be referred for their origin and development to these original modal

forces: that....it is possible for us with the wider knowledge of comparative grammar at hand to.... show which of these substantive clauses were in their origin volitive, (Determined Resolution, jussive), and which were optative (Wish, Contingent Futurity): furthermore that *nē* (*neq̄, nī, neu, neue*), is the negative of the Volitive and the Optative, along with their developments, while *non* (*neq̄, neque*) is the negative of the Subjunctive of Contingent Futurity, and its several developments and....that this development [viz. from the two sources named], 'as indicated by the negative employed is always capable of demonstration except in those rare cases where subsequent development on Latin soil 'can be definitely shown.'

Mr. Durham's attitude towards the grammatical questions to which America has lately devoted a superfluity of energy is clear from this quotation, and it appears to be in the main a correct though hardly a novel one. His treatise works out in detail the development or decay of meaning of the subjunctive in the various classes into which he distributes its uses, cataloguing each of the several heads, first the original use when it is extant, and then the 'derived' uses according to the various extensions enumerated on pp. 11 *sq.*, such as 'extension in tense,' 'Negative' 'Interrogative,' 'Passive' extensions. Here, too, Mr. Durham is sound in the main, though he does not sift enough. Thus he appears to take no account of the Plautine metre as modifying Plautine syntax. For example under the original uses of *uolo* with subjunctive alone seven examples are given, in five of these *uolo* forms the final iambus in an iambic or trochaic line; of the rest one is from a prologue (Mr. Durham betrays no misgivings about the genuineness of the prologues) and there remains only *Poenulus* 1197. Similarly under *uolo* with 'the subjunctive following,' *Rudens* 414 (read 1414) '*iuris iurando* (read -i) *uolo gratiam facias*,' is quoted without remark, though the position of the main verb is similarly fixed. There is a like neglect of the verb's position in the verse in the case of *face, uide, licet*.

Mr. Durham does not regard the order of words in a phrase with sufficient respect, or he would hardly have maintained that in *potin' abeas* and the like the original meaning was *go away! can't you?* Considering the frequency of *potin' ut abeas*, etc., it seems more likely that this form is the older, and that the twice occurring *potin' abeas* is a variation upon it for the purpose of giving greater abruptness. We may here refer to the Cornell explanation of *ut* in certain clauses which Mr. Durham it would seem derives from his teacher Prof. Bennett, *Latin Gr.*

Appendix § 368.¹ *Ut*, it is said, had sometimes 'an indefinite value corresponding to that of *qui* 'in some way,' 'somehow,' 'just.' 'That *ut* did have this force seems clear from the fact that it is freely used interchangeably with *qui* in independent optative and jussive uses in early Latin: cf. e.g., Terence *Phorm.* 123 *qui illum di omnes perduint* with Eum. 302 *ut illum di deaque perdant*.' The suggestion is more ingenious than plausible. Both *qui* and *ut* in such sentences may be originally interrogative, like the Greek *πῶς* as used in wishes. The author applies this 'somehow,' 'just,' theory to all the *ut* clauses that he can, amongst them to those which follow verbs of fearing. For more years than I care to remember, I have taught that *metuo, ut ueniat* meant originally 'I am afraid: how can he come?' and 'so I am afraid he will not come,' and that this is why it is not found after a negative, 'I am not afraid; how can he come?' being an absurdity, but *ne non* is used instead. Who should be credited with first publishing this view, I do not know; but it must be well known by this time and it appears to have more than one advantage over the suggestion that *ut ueniat* in such clauses meant originally 'just let him come,' 'O that he might only come.' The order of words is disregarded again when it is maintained that *metuo ne ueniat* is an inversion for *ne ueniat: metuo* (p. 4). What grounds, linguistic or psychological, are there for this assumption? The following expressions are neither classical English nor attractive neologisms. 'My thanks are also due Professor Elmer (preface); ('Morris . . . who aims to suggest that' (p. 2). The volume has an index—a welcome addition to its utility.

I touch next on a paper in which Mr. Durham is referred to and which deals with the Subjunctives of pp. 64–69 of his treatise. In his 'Stipulative Subjunctive in Latin,' Prof. C. E. BENNETT has done well to call attention to a somewhat puzzling use of the subjunctive. His typical example is *Plaut. Bacch.* 873 *sq.* '*uis tibi ducentos nummos iam promittit | ut ne clamorem hic facias neu conuicium | ... atque ut tibi mala multa ingeram*.' "Will you agree to take two hundred nummi on the understanding that you are to make no outcry or disturbance . . . and that I am to abuse you roundly?" To this usage he earlier gave the name 'Stipulative' (*Cornell Studies*. ix. p. 21). The new name

¹ Mr. Durham also adopts Prof. Bennett's views on the Stipulative.

was hardly wanted, and the increase of grammatical terms is a real hindrance to grammatical study. But protest in a matter of this kind is usually unavailing. This subjunctive Prof. Bennett regards as of 'jussive' (or 'volitive') origin; and I think this is clearly right. He properly dwells upon the point that *ne* (not *non*) is the negative of the jussive and that *ne* and *ut ne* are found in the 'Stipulative.' But, in his eagerness to find Stipulatives under every stone, he proceeds to weaken his argument by referring to the same origin sentences in which the negative is *non* and which previous inquirers have been satisfied to regard as 'consecutive.' As Prof. Bennett does not deny the existence in Latin of a true 'consecutive' subjunctive (that is, a subjunctive to which, when negated, Greek *ὥστε* with *οὐ* and an indicative would correspond), it is enough to observe that, if e.g. Cic. *Div. in Caecil.* 46 'cuius ego ingenium ita laudo ut *non peritescam*' be stipulative, there is not a single consecutive sentence in the language that cannot be made out to be so too. The same spectre disturbs Prof. Bennett's vision when he examines the constructions of *tanti*, *non tanti*. He says p. 246, 'An examination of the very numerous examples of the idiom I have gathered points clearly to another' [i.e. non consecutive] origin of the *ut*-clause occurring in it. In the negative type of the clause after *tanti* we never have *ut non* but *ne* e.g. and then two examples are quoted. One is Seneca de Ben. iii. 23 'tanti iudicauerunt ne domina occideretur uideri dominam occidisse,' of which Prof. Bennett says it 'plainly means they deemed it worth while (*tanti*) to seem to have murdered their mistress, on the understanding that she wasn't really to be murdered.'! Thus enter Stipulative. The incident on which Seneca is commenting is this. At the capture of Grumentum two slaves who had previously deserted to the besiegers saved their mistress' life by a noteworthy stratagem: 'dominam suam ante se egisse; quaerentibus quanam esset, dominam et quidem crudelissimam ad supplicium ab ipsis duci professos esse. eductam deinde extra muros summa cura celasse donec hostilis ira consideret. deinde, ut satius miles cito ad Romanos mores rediit, illos quoque ad suos redisse et dominam sibi ipsos dedisse.' The words which immediately precede the sentence in which *tanti* occurs 'a uictoribus ad captiuam transfugerunt, personam parricidarum ferentes quod in illo beneficio maximo fuit' show that Seneca had in view no such psychical farce

as Prof. Bennett would make him impute to the slaves, and that his meaning is this: 'to save their mistress from being murdered (a final *ne*), the slaves were willing to incur the odium (called *fama sceleris* in the next section) of being considered her murderers.' The other example is still more remarkable. In Propertius iv. 12. 8 [iii. (iv.) 12. 4] 'tantine ulla fuit spoliati gloria Parthi ne faceres Galla multa rogante tua?', since Bekker refuted the error of Bach, it has been customary to construe *ne faceres* (= *ne signa sequeris*) with *rogante*.

Prof. Bennett takes Juvenal x. 98 'sed quae praeclara et prospera tanti | ut rebus laetis par sit mensura malorum?' as his 'typical example.' But method in syntax demands that in investigating a usage we should start with the earliest and not the latest author of the period that we are examining. And this example of the idiom is not a 'typical' one, otherwise Madvig, whose discussion in his opuscula ii. 189-195 still contains all that is worth reading on the subject, would not have spent so much trouble upon bringing out its meaning. This is obscured by the fact that the expression in the *ut* clause is a variation on a more natural one, such as 'ut laetis rebus *paria mala accipias*.' There is no difficulty that I can see in understanding a phrase like 'haec hereditas tanti est ut de ciuitate in dubium ueniam' as 'this inheritance is so valuable that I would imperil for it my civic rights' 'ut in dubium ueniam,' *ὥστε κινδυνεύωμαι ἄν*. When Madvig expands the sense of Ovid Met. 10. 619 'amat tantique putat conubia nostra | ut pereat' by 'hoc est ut perire uelit' he has Ovid himself upon his side, R.A. 750 (quoted by Prof. Bennett) 'non tamen hoc tanti est, pauper ut esse uelis' where, metro permittente, he might have written *sis*. What sense *uelis* has in a 'stipulative' or jussive sentence we have yet to learn.

MR. BABCOCK's study is an excellent piece of work. The first chapter, of 14 pages, is a historical survey of the previous utterances on the subject. Their diversity and incongruity is of itself proof that a fresh inquiry was needed. Chapter II. (26 pages) is a collection of all the instances in extant literature down to the end of the Augustan period, in which a verb of remembering or forgetting occurs with a direct object in either the genitive or the accusative case. The arrangement is chronological; and under the authors the uses are distributed according to the verbs employed. A noticeable

result is the disappearance of *recorder* with gen. from the Ciceronian writings. A supplement to this chapter gives a summary compiled from various indexes of the usages of post-Augustan writers as far as Justin. The results are then tabulated. Chapter III. contains the writer's reconstruction. The first part is critical and analyses the three principal views which have been put forward.

(i) That the genitive after verbs of remembering is the so-called *partitive* genitive,

(ii) That the genitive is due to the substantive idea inhering in the verb,

(iii) That the difference between the genitive and the accusative is of a more special character; e.g. that these verbs take a gen. of the object when used of a continued state of mind but the acc. when used of a single act (Greenough).

Mr. Babcock shows conclusively that all these theories are unsatisfactory. We next have his own results which we may thus briefly summarise.

The genitive with these verbs was a development. Rare at first, it ultimately displaced the accusative. This is evidenced by the grammarian Nonius who quotes some dozen instances of 'Accusativus pro genitivus' but not one of 'genitivus pro accusativus.' This development was due to (i) the genitive with the participle-adjective *oblitus*, (ii) the genitive which has from the first the regular construction of the personal and reflexive pronouns (*meminit sui*).

'These two forces operated to give rise to and to increase a strong genitive tendency on the part of *obliscor*. The use of the genitive with *memini* seems to be due partly to the influence of the personal and reflexive pronouns, still more to the influence of its opposite *obliscor*. Thus we find no increase in the proportion of genitives with *memini*, in the Ciceronian period as against early Latin, but in the Augustan age, when the genitive with *obliscor* had become practically universal, the increase of the genitive with *memini* is very rapid' (p. 71).

On the first point Mr. Babcock says that in only 3 passages out of 94 has he found an accusative following the adjective or participle *oblitus*. One of these is a fragment of Accius 'mea facta in acie obliti' where the context, if we had it, might show that *obliti* was really verbal. In Livy 22. 58. 8 the acc. is a neuter pronoun whose use, it is well known, was subject to rules of their own. The last is Virg. G. 2. 59 'pomaque degenerant sucos oblita priores' which disquiets Mr. Babcock most. Here however we are not forced to construct *sucos* with *oblita* as it may be taken also with *degenerant*. See Ovid Met. 7. 543 sqq.,

a place on which some stress may be laid as it contains both the words, 'acer ecus quondam magnaecque in puluere famae | degenerat palmas ueterumque *oblitus* honorum, | ad praesepe gemit,' with other passages. The one recalcitrant example thus disappears. The author's final conclusion that it is not possible to discover a dynamical difference between the two cases or to lay down inflexible rules for their use at any given period will be I fear disappointing or unpalatable to many people; but to those who bear in mind that 'Cicero de Div. i. 63 writes *meminit praeteritorum*' while in 'In de Fin. i. 62 he writes *praeterita meminit*' it will seem a wise and commendable reserve.

Mr. NEVILLE's conclusions briefly stated, are as follows (see pp. 85 sq.)

A (i) The *Ablative* is always used in the expressions (a) *opinione, spe, expectatione: aequo, iusto*, e.g. 'opinione celerius,' 'iusto grauius'; (b) *alius alio*.

(ii) It is regularly used in:

(a) Universal negative sentences whether of the accusative or nominative type.

(b) Rhetorical questions.

(c) Proverbial expressions.

B The *Ablative* or *quam* is used indifferently

(a) when the comparative agrees with an accusative, the object of a verb in a positive sentence.

(b) when the adjective agrees with the first term of the comparison in the nominative.

C Elsewhere *quam* is either (a) *regular* or (b) *necessary*. It is necessary in all cases where the comparative adjective is not in agreement with a noun in the nominative or accusative constituting the first term of the comparison. Thus 'senex est meliore condicione quam adulescens,' though we may have 'senex melior' (or 'senem meliorem') 'adulescente.'

As Mr. Neville treats of only a part of the history of the comparative, he should have separated the pre-classical and classical usages. The gap between Cicero and Cato or even between Lucretius and Eunius is much wider than that between the later republican and the Augustan writers. Should he continue his researches, it is to be hoped he will give us a sketch in proper perspective of the whole period down to the beginning of the Empire.

His treatment is in general clear and methodical; and his monograph advances our knowledge of the subject. But he leans too much to subdivision. Classification may easily become too minute; and a certain residue of examples is better left to be appreciated by the linguistic sense unhampered by the consideration of categories. He is aware that in a given case a construc-

tion may be determined by a concurrence of considerations: but sometimes he forgets this, as in his remark that 'the rule which states that the relative pronoun never has the *quam*-construction is entirely unnecessary.' It would certainly appear that the ablative is found in all examples where the statement is explicitly or, as in rhetorical questions (*quo quid turpius?*), implicitly a universal negative. But *quam qui* is of itself as impossible as *quam quibus* or *ore ōs*, and I fail to see why this consideration should be neglected. Mr. Neville properly notes the frequency of phrases of the form '*Quid* Petronio fuit stultius?' instead of *quis*; but he should have observed that the gender is not wholly insignificant. *Quis* confines the comparison to persons. *Quid* is wider, it includes things and thus expresses more emphasis, and, in the example quoted, more contempt. As Mr. Neville makes a special class for sentences containing *neminem* and of the type '*miseriorem quam te uidi neminem*' Plaut. Cas. 520, we may note that in his two exceptions Cic. Fam. 3. 5. 1, Phil. xi. 5, 12, the correlative of *neminem* is also the relative *quo* (abl.).

There is a strange slip on p. 42. Catullus 21, 8 contains *prior*, it is true, and an ablative; but these have nothing to do with this inquiry. In Cic. or. post red. 10, 25, '*quid* [ego] gloriosius [meis posteris potui relinquere] quam hoc senatum iudicasse qui me ciuis non defendisset, eum rempublicam saluam noluisse.' The words in square brackets are omitted, and the passage is quoted as an exception to the rule of category XVII. 'It is often desirable to sum up a following infinitive or other modal construction, that takes *quam*, by a neuter pronoun; this pronoun is put in the ablative after a comparative.' Now is this an 'exception'? Does Mr. Neville think that a Latin stylist of any age whatever would in this sentence have inserted an *hoc* (abl.) with *gloriosius*? It may be an exception to a pigeon-hole category; but what rule or even tendency of Latin speech does it run counter to? To say of Cic. Fin. 4 § 10, '*ars tamen est dux certior quam natura*' 'The form of this sentence is unparalleled; in no other instance do we find a predicate appositive appearing in comparative sentences, as *dux* does here' (p. 41) is the extremity of formalism. Supposing the use were unique, what then? But is not Verr. 4. 55. 123 (of Verres), which Mr. Neville cites on p. 35 with the words in brackets omitted, near enough for our purpose '[uidete] quanto *tætrior*

hic tyrannus [Syracusanis fuerit] *quam quisquam* [superiorum]?' How is *tætrior tyrannus* a different conjunction from *dux certior*? Mr. Neville's habit of reducing his quotations to an absolute minimum saves space, it is true; but the parsimony is, for all that, mistaken. In many cases the usage cannot be properly appreciated unless its environment is given in full.

DR. MEADER'S book, which is dedicated to his teacher, Prof. Wölfflin, consists practically of monographs on four Latin pronouns, *is*, *hic*, *iste*, *ipse*, together with a fifth on the pronouns used for the determinative *is* and for the definite article. As his list of materials shows, he has read widely in every period of Latin. The outcome of his reading is presented in the form of more or less definite statements illustrated by quotations, and from time to time by statistics. The book shows how the study of even an unpromising subject like pronouns may be made not only profitable but interesting. The classical poets' avoidance of *is*, the rivalry and confusion of *is* and *hic*, the development of what we may call a new *hic* in *iste*, the use of *ipse* for *idem* in post-classical and the use of all these as well as *ille* in Christian Latin to represent the definite article (ὁ ἡ τό) with other topics of these pronouns' usages are treated of in such a way as to attract those who care only for grammar and those who care only for style. Dr. Meader does not neglect the influence of metre in determining poetic usage; but he is not yet perfect in the somewhat difficult task of comparing statistics of usage in verse with statistics of usage in prose. His comparative statement of the frequency of different parts of *is* in Caesar, Plautus, and the poets, will I fear be somewhat misleading. For the pressure of quantity was by no means so heavy on the prose writer as on the poet, and so the prose expression has less temptation to run in grooves. Accordingly to take an example, the uses of *ea* (fem. sing.) and *ea* (neut. plur.), whose occurrences both in prose and poetry are lumped together by Dr. Meader, are likely to be governed by very different considerations in the two kinds of composition. I do not wish to dwell upon small faults in what for a first book is a most meritorious performance: and so I will only suggest to Dr. Meader that when he publishes his monographs upon *ille* and *idem* he should not omit an index and that he should use either italics or at least inverted commas to help his readers' eyes in distinguishing Latin

quotations from English text. There is no question which is clearer: is is found—or is is found—.

Since the appearance of Prof. Hale's memorable investigations of *cum* constructions (*Cornell Studies*, 1887-9) the activity of 'the American school'¹ in the department of Latin syntax has been very remarkable. And some general observations on its character and tendencies, free from any comparison whether overt or covert with activities elsewhere, may form no unfitting pendant to these notices.

As in a matter of this kind the question of ultimate utility cannot be altogether excluded, I must frankly confess that I am not in sympathy with an idea which seems to enjoy wide currency and powerful countenance in the United States. The study of Latin or for that matter Greek grammar is not to be regarded, like ping-pong, as an end in itself. Its sole value is that it contributes to the understanding of the ancient literature or of the workings of the human mind. As however the investigation of syntactical phenomena need not necessarily be harmed and may in fact be stimulated by this exaggeration of the importance of syntax, I do not dwell upon it here and pass on from aim to procedure.

For its recognition of method and system and of the need for exhausting the field of facts with which it is concerned recent American syntactical inquiry is deserving of the greatest credit. It has moreover thoroughly grasped the importance of such practical principles as division of labour, use of time-saving devices, and attention to one thing at once. But it cannot be altogether acquitted of the charge of producing in haste. It is not so long ago that a series of articles upon a difficult and complicated grammatical problem appeared in a journal, edited by an American grammarian of acknowledged eminence in which one of the chief things to strike the reader were the words 'hurried' and 'hurriedly' which the writer applied more than once to his own procedure. This 'hurry' is completely inconsistent with sound work in syntax. The professed investigator of some detail of syntax through a literature or a considerable number of authors has the general reader entirely at his mercy; and he is in literary honour

bound to see that his material is complete before he prints a line and his corrigenda ought to be limited, as e.g. Mr. Durham's and Mr. Neville's are not limited, to errors of the press. But I need not say more on this subject as an American scholar has just dwelt with emphasis on the vital importance of accuracy in the details of a syntactical inquiry in the columns of this review.

The widespread, though not of course universal, indifference of America to textual matters must have struck others before now. Rarely, however, does it take so naive a form as in Mr. Neville's Preface: 'For the citations in this paper I have used the Teubner series under the belief that they were the most *accessible* (my italics), complete texts of the authors included in the investigation.' But a syntactician cannot get off so easily. It is his duty not merely to use the best texts, which do not necessarily grow in series's, but to ascertain for himself the actual facts about the texts by reference to the standard critical editions, and further in strict connexion with his grammatical inquiries to discuss the reading of all passages which are disputed or disputable. If he fails to do this, he may count himself fortunate if he does not find too late that he has built his house of conclusions and statistics upon a rotten foundation. Here too I am glad to refer for support to a native American scholar. Prof. E. B. Lease in a passage, which I had not read when I wrote the above notices, says in *Studies in Honor of B. L. Gildersleeve*, p. 414 n. 'It is unfortunate that a complete *apparatus criticus* for every writer of the Silver Age is not available. In an investigation of this sort, the knowledge of all variations in text tradition is an obvious necessity.'

It may perhaps be a result of studying classics in editions 'for rapid reading' (well enough in their place) that the conditions of a context such as metre and rhythm, archaic tone and so forth are not always held in sufficient regard. Even simple syntactical usages are often the product of a complex of tendencies, nor can they be cut out of their context and labelled without more ado. To sum up, we are indebted to 'the American School' (I am speaking only of the younger writers; this article has no reference to the veterans) for a great deal of good work in syntax, but this would have been none the worse for some more circumspection and insight and a little less attention to mechanism.

J. P. POSTGATE.

¹ This designation is from the table of contents of E. P. Morris' recently published 'Principles and methods in Latin Syntax,' where it is associated with the names of Hale Bennett and Elmer.

PERSSON'S GERUND AND GERUNDIVE.

De Origine ac Vi Primigenia Gerundii et Gerundivi Latini. (Skrifter utgifna af K. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Upsala, iii. 4.) Scripsit P. PERSSON. Pp. [i], 138. Upsala (Lundström) and Leipzig (Harrassowitz), 1900. M. 3.

UNDER the above title the author of the *Studien zur Lehre von der Wurzelweiterung und Wurzelvariation* (1891) comes well prepared to a discussion of perhaps the most disputed of all grammatical forms. It is a curious circumstance in connection with the Latin Gerund and Gerundive that nearly all the possibilities of etymological explanation were suggested at a quite early date and several of them have been revived with new explanations in recent years. Dr. Persson, who devotes the first twenty-five of his pages to a critical review, is himself the exponent of a theory which in a crude form originated with Corssen.

It is gratifying for a reviewer to be able to announce that in his opinion a decisive word has now been uttered in this long debate, and I do so all the more readily inasmuch as I have myself (see *Cambridge University Reporter* for Nov. 21, 1899 and *Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society* vol. v. part ii., 1900, *The D-Suffix*) been led by much the same evidence to nearly identical views. It is a sound maxim that forms which resist explanation within the individual language are probably legacies from a parent tongue, and Dr. Persson's simple solution of the present problem is to refer the termination *-endo -ondo-* to the *Ursprache*. It is therefore a question of evidence. In the face of the testimony adduced, especially from the Litu-Slavonic languages, it seems difficult to deny that such a suffix existed in the Indo-European mother tongue, and that this is the source of the Latin forms. It is further shown that this secondary suffix was connected with a primary suffix in *-nd* and hence with the *d*-suffix generally. In the papers above referred to I have sought to prove also, (1) that a participle in *-do* was part of the ordinary complement of the I.E. verb, (2) that the termination in *-ndo* was frequently accompanied by a hypocoristic sense, and thus comes into connection with the *d* of the Greek and Latin patronymics, (3) that the athematic nouns in *-d* were largely abstracts and collectives, and (4) that the

Teutonic languages afford evidence of a collective sense in the *d*-suffix and a patronymic employment of that in *-nd*.

For the detailed proof of Dr. Persson's thesis we must refer to the work itself. The words now first introduced into the discussion are for the most part derived from Leskien's *Bildung der Nomina im Litauischen* and from the great storehouse of Miklosich's Slavonic Grammar. One of the most interesting examples of the *-ndo* suffix as a primary is the Latin *-bundus* which we may now most reasonably regard as a direct representative of an original *bhündos*.

The latter part of the book (pp. 85-135) is devoted to a discussion of the relations of the gerund and gerundive in Latin, and this problem will appeal to a wider public. Weisweiler has proved that the earlier in time was the gerundive, from which the gerund can be derived without difficulty and with the support of analogies in other languages. But he also ascribes to the forms an inherent notion of passivity and of necessity. This view, which has been accepted by Brugmann, *Grundriss* ii. p. 1424 and by others, requires a forced explanation of such words as *labundus* and *secundus*, and fails entirely to account for the words in *-ndo* which have no attachment to verbs. It has been conclusively refuted by Dr. Persson, whose own opinion may be summed up in two quotations:—

Sic igitur censeo in structuris gerundivis, quae vocantur, gerundivum ipsum per se principio nusquam finalem vim habuisse neque actionem gerendam significasse, sed in multis locutionibus orationis contextu factum esse, ut talem significationem acciperet. Quod si ita est, ex hoc quoque fonte illa significatio latius manare potuit (p. 112).

and again

Haec omnia qui consideraverit, eum credo Weisweilero vix adensurum prorsus neganti in Latinis participiis suffixo *-ndo* terminatis ullam nisi passivam inesse potuisse significationem. Immo, dum demonstratum erit (quod hucusque quidem demonstratum non est) ipsum suffixum *-ndo* eiusmodi esse, unde non potuerit nisi passiva provenire significatio, credere licebit figuram in *-ndo* cadentem non magis

quam cetera participia, de quibus supra egi, 'necessario' passivam esse. Quod confirmare videntur adjectiva illa suff. -undo -cundo- formata, de quibus supra p. 63 egi: haec enim omnia a participiis passivae significationis repetere vix licet (p. 91).

Thus, in fine, *legendus* originally meant neither 'being read' nor 'to be read' nor even 'reading,' but bore the indifferent sense of the noun-adjective in such a phrase as 'a reading desk.' In accordance with this view Dr. Persson regards the names of the divinities *Adolenda*, etc. as properly nouns of action. It seems somewhat inconsistent, if one may raise a small point,

after this to treat *calendae* as an adjective with *dies* understood, when we may easily suppose the original sense to have been 'hustings.' *Dies* would probably have demanded a masculine *calendi* (cf. *fasti*), and if anything were to be substituted, our preference would lie, in spite of Dr. Persson's protest, p. 96 n., with *feriae*.¹ The Greek words in -ado seem to me for the most part to come not from *ndo*, but from -ado-. But Dr. Persson (pp. 35-7) does not insist over-much upon this point. F. W. THOMAS.

¹ It is curious that the Slavonic dialects which have a word *kolenda*, 'new year's day,' supposed to be borrowed from Lat. *calendae*, exhibit also a form *merendya* denoting 'provision for a journey': cf. Lat. *merenda*.

PISCHEL AND GELDNER'S *VEDISCHE STUDIEN*.

Vedische Studien. VON RICHARD PISCHEL und KARL F. GELDNER. Dritter Band. Pp. [ii], 215. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1901. M. 7.

IN this third volume of the *Vedische Studien* the distinguished authors continue the application of their now well-understood principles to the interpretation of Vedic lexicography. The view that the Rg-Veda is essentially an Indian book and cannot properly be held apart from subsequent literature is one which commands assent. In no language can the meanings of texts or even of words be determined by mere etymologizing, a fact which was familiar to the Indian grammarians, who distinguished between the *rūḍha*, or conventional, and the *yangika*, or etymological, sense. But though this was, of course, not overlooked by the school of Roth and Whitney, in practice they assigned a very inconsiderable weight to the tradition of native grammarians and lexicographers. The reliability of these is now much more highly appreciated in many departments. It is the merit of Pischel and Geldner to have considered their opinions more attentively in connection with the Veda. We must add also that they have more carefully than their predecessors employed the comparison of similar passages in the interpretation of the Veda from itself, and such comparison has indeed formed the bulk of the matter in these three volumes. It would be difficult to name two scholars whose combined command of the

great range of Sanskrit and Iranian literature better fits them for the task which Pischel and Geldner have undertaken.

One or two interesting propositions of a general character are enunciated, though not elaborated, in the present volume. On p. 152 the old view that the hymns were composed on the banks of the Indus is rejected in favour of Brahmāvarta, the holy land of Brahmanical India. 'Though in R.V. times single Aryan tribes may have been established on the banks of the Indus and its tributary streams, nevertheless the region of the Sarasvatī, i.e. Brahmāvarta, Kurukṣetra, the land of the Brahmarṣis in general, was its proper home. All geographical data of the R.V. combine to prove this. The Sarasvatī is never the Indus. In the broad, mostly dry and barren plains of the Panjab, lying between the Indus and the Sarasvatī, the R.V. people could not be settled, since in fact no people could permanently fix its abode there.' The importance for all Vedic questions of this proposition, stated, indeed, though less definitely, in vol. 2, p. 218, cannot be over-estimated, and it will no doubt attract the attention of scholars. A more hazardous suggestion is made, p. 26, that writing was known to authors of R.V. hymns: a Vedic employment of writing was thought not impossible by Bühler *Indische Palaeographie* p. 4. The date of the *pada* text is an old *streitfrage*: Geldner proposes to accept the traditions which make its originator Śākalya a contemporary of Aruṇi and his pupil

Yājñavalkya, and the *pada* text therefore as old as the White Yajur Veda (pp. 144-6). We hope that Pischel's discussion of the phrase *sāre dukhītā* will not escape the observation of comparative philologists, who have adopted with too great enthusiasm the explanation of *sāre* as a genitive derived from *sāraz* (Brugmann now accepts Pischel's view *Indog. Forsch.* xiii, p. 149 n). On p. 126 we are told that the 'cloud-mountains' are a dream of the Comparative Mythologists.

It is impossible for a reviewer to discuss in detail the many new interpretations of words and phrases which form the bulk of the volume. The lion's share belongs to Geldner, his colleague having been much preoccupied with his Prākṛit Grammar and his duties as Rector at Halle. The longest articles deal with the words *ari*, of which the general meaning is given as 'rich man,' *vip* = 'tongue,' *yakṣa* = 'marvel,' and 'a marvel,' and the roots *ṛj* and *yat*. We may refer briefly to one or two points. The word *dvitā* is now explained as meaning 'by oneself,' 'alone,' 'in person,' &c. It is, therefore, equivalent in root and sense to the Greek *δίχα* and as regards *tmanā*, which is used to convey the same meaning, we may add that the classical *ātmanā* is similarly employed. Whether *ātman* is really to be separated from *āthem*, etc., and to be derived from *vat* (p. 116), one would not like to

decide in haste. On the other hand Pischel's explanation of *apsaras* as = *arūpa* and the opposite of *sapsaras* (p. 197) is convincing. *Dhenā* in the sense of 'sister' belongs of course to the root of *θῆλή*, *τιθήνη* *filius*, etc., and may be used in support of the derivation of *duhitar* from *duh*. *Svasara*, as denoting a time of day, recalls the Greek *βουλῆτος*. In connection with the word *āścarya* 'marvel' p. 130, we may note that the same root appears in *avaskara* 'secret,' etc., and in the Zend *skar* 'leap,' Greek *σκαίρω*, etc. In equating the Sanskrit *ohate* to the Greek *εὐχεται*, Geldner is in agreement with a note printed in this *Review*, Vol. iv. p. 63.

A very interesting feature of this, as of the earlier volumes, is the treatment of whole hymns. This forms an admirable test of the principles followed, and no one who examines Geldner's discussion of the hymn R. V. I, 105 will deny that in this case the light derived from later literature has restored the poetry of the old Rsi's verse.

A work dealing with many debated questions could scarcely pass by the views of other authorities, and without criticism there is no progress. We welcome the courteous tone here maintained and the absence of acrimony in the references, in some cases necessarily frequent, to the authors of controverted views.

F. W. THOMAS.

REPORTS.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE OXFORD PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.—HILARY TERM, 1902.

ON January 31st, Prof. COOK WILSON read a paper on the 'ἰνδοζώματα of Greek ships.'

The view connected with the name of Böckh though really due to J. G. Schneider, that the ἰνδοζώματα passed from stem to stern outside the vessel horizontally, seemed to be abandoned by the most recent writers, who return to the improbable view that the ἰνδοζώματα was a straight hawser stretched from stem to stern inside the vessel; probably because they (as well as even writers who agreed with Böckh), were unaware of the existence of an important piece of evidence which it was the main object of the paper to resuscitate. This was a small bronze, representing the fore part of a trireme shewing ropes passing exactly as Böckh supposed. Though Böckh himself referred to it and to a representation of it in an old book—Bregier's *Thesaurus Erandeburgicus*, vol. III p. 406,—there was no sign in the more modern writers that they knew of its existence, and it had apparently been lost sight of for perhaps sixty years. [Since reading the paper Mr. Wilson has been able by the kindness of Dr. E.

Pernice of the Königl. Museen to verify the existence of the bronze in the Berlin Museum, and to obtain photographs of it which he hopes to publish.]

Further it was probable that there were two kinds of ἰνδοζώματα, not only one of the kind supposed by J. G. Schneider carried by triremes under all circumstances, but also one applied temporarily after storms or sea-lights, to prevent leakage and passing in a vertical plane under the keel.

The passages, cognate to the subject, on the construction of battering rams in Vitruvius and Athenaeus (*Mechanicus*) were also discussed, and it was maintained that their bearing had been misunderstood and that they really contained evidence of the existence of the two kinds of ἰνδοζώματα.

[Since reading the above paper I find I have overstated the neglect of the bronze relief. Its importance has been curiously misunderstood, but Böckh's reference to it has been remarked upon. I hope to publish a detailed discussion of the subject shortly.—J. COOK WILSON.]

On February 7th, Mr. JOACHIM of Merton College, read a paper on 'Aristotle's theory of Chemical Combination.' The paper dealt first with Aristotle's use of the terms *σύνθεσις*, *κρᾶσις*, and *μίξις*, and showed that in strict Aristotelian terminology *σύνθεσις* means 'mechanical mixture,' *μίξις* 'chemical combination' in general, and *κρᾶσις* the 'chemical combination of liquids.'

Next, the general principle of the distinction between *σύνθεσις* and *μίξις* was stated: and it was shown that every *μικθὲν* is necessarily *δμοιομερές*. The nature of the *δμοιομερῆ* was then explained. It was shown that they all involved the same four components, and that the difference between them depends upon the 'combining-proportions' of these components. The definition of any *δμοιομερές* is the *λόγος τῆς μίξεως* of its components.

The paper then proceeded to discuss at length the details of Aristotle's theory of *μίξις*. It endeavoured (by a consideration of the relevant passages in the *περί γενέσεως καὶ φθορᾶς* and in the fourth book of the *Meteorologica*), to answer the questions, (1) what are the constituents of the *δμοιομερῆ*?, and (2) what takes place between these constituents in the process of *μίξις*? In connection with the first question, the nature of the elements, and of the tactical qualities in virtue of which they combine, was discussed at length: and in connection with the second question, it was shown that Aristotle recognizes a double operation in the production of a *μικθὲν*, viz: (a) a transient reciprocal action of Contrary on Contrary, and (b) an immanent action of the 'tempered-hot' on the 'Moist and Dry.'

On February 14th, Mr. MACAN, of University College, read a paper on 'B. Keil's *Anonymus Argentinensis* (1902).' While accepting in the main the editor's conjectural emendations, and recognising the many valuable and stimulating *aperçus* in his discussion of the new text, the reader challenged several of the novel conclusions propounded by Dr. Keil in regard to the history of the Delian League, in particular (1) the amount of the supposed reserve fund: (2) the personal intervention of Perikles in the Delian synd: (3) the date of the transfer of the treasury from Delos to Athens. On the first point Mr. Macan argued that at the date of the transfer to Athens (still dated 454/3 B.C.), there was little, if any surplus, in the treasury at Delos. The psephism of Perikles, recorded in the new papyrus, was (he argued) an act not of the Delian synd but of the Athenian ekklesia. As to the date, the advent of the tributes to Athens should not be separated from the first payment of the Quota (*ἀπαρχή*) to Athens (453 B.C.). The act of Perikles, dated in the papyrus to 450/49 B.C. might (he suggested) be interpreted as an inaccurate report of the original motion for the formation of a reserve-fund, and its deposit in the Akropolis. (The substance of the paper will probably appear elsewhere.)

On February 21st, Mr. COWLEY, of Wadham College, read a paper containing notes on the Lycian Inscriptions. After a short account of the work hitherto done in elucidating the inscriptions, the arguments were discussed for and against the Indo-European character of Lycian. By a comparison with Old Persian grammar it was shown to be probable that the Lycian inflexions are Indo-European. On the other hand the vocabulary seems for the most part not to be so. The conclusion suggested was that the language points to a mixture of races: that an originally Indo-European people, while retaining their grammar, took over an alien vocabulary from conquerors or conquered. The affinities of the

latter were not discussed, but it was suggested that the foreign element represented a race at one time widely spread over Asia Minor and perhaps other parts of the west of the Mediterranean.

On February 28th, Prof. BYWATER, read a paper containing suggestions on the text of Plato Rep. 328 c, 359 E, 363 A, 380 D, 405 B, 408 A, 442 E.—Aristotle De Coelo 2, 12, p. 292^a, 26: Metaph. 1, 1, p. 981^a, 12: 1, 8, p. 988^b, 28: Rhet. 1, 1, 1354^a, 8. The paper will probably be shortly published.

On March 7th, a paper was read by Dr. L. R. FARNELL, of Exeter College, on 'Usener's theory concerning the Roman Indigitamenta and its bearing on the Hero- and Daimon-cults of Greece.' After giving a list of the cults of those *ἥρωες* or *δαίμονες* that are designated merely by an adjectival name, or a name expressive of some special function, such as *ἥρωες ἐπιτέγιοι*, *Εβίστοτοι*, *Ἐχέτλαιοι*, *Κνωμίτις*, *Στρατηγός*, *Ἰατρός*, *Ταράξιππος*, etc., the reader proceeded to examine the view set forth by Dr. Usener in his 'Götternamen' that such cults are relics of an older stage of European religion, the period of 'Sondergötter' and 'Augenblick-Götter,' shadowy potencies that were narrower in range and less anthropomorphic than the forms of Hellenic polytheism: that the latter concrete personalities were in some way evolved from the former, and that traces of the older system survived also in the Roman Indigitamenta and in certain features of the Lithuanian religion. Confining himself mainly to the Greek evidence, and admitting that there were discoverable traces in Greek religion of pre-anthropomorphic conceptions, the reader argued that the evidence failed to support Dr. Usener's far-reaching theory: (a) a deity was not necessarily nameless, because he was not usually named, for primitive as well as higher races have a tendency to conceal or rarely to employ the personal name: (b) many of these adjectival or functional names are as personal and anthropomorphic as names like Apollo or Athena: (c) many are of a late period, being mere by-products of fully developed polytheism and implying the cults of the High Gods: (d) some may have been descriptive titles of real individuals who were 'heroised' after their death under functional names, such as *Ἰατρός*, *Στρατηγός*, in Attica, *Σύμμαχος* in Thessaly, *Ἐπίμαχος* at Knidos and Erythrae, others such as *Ταράξιππος* show the desire to invent a designation for a ghostly personality that hovered round a forgotten grave: (e) others such as *Κέραμος*, *Κεράων* and *Μάτταν* were obvious fictions, parallel to the fictitious personalities of eponymous heroes of tribe or clan: (f) names like *Κουροτρόφος*, *Καλλιγένεια* may have easily been detached from some concrete High Goddess, Greek polytheism being specially prone to such detachments: (g) even such a presumably primitive figure as *Εβίστοτος* of Tanagra, the aboriginal hero of an agricultural ritual that prevailed in Greece, as elsewhere in Europe, perhaps before the evolution of the 'Olympian order,' is in legend and cult as personal as Apollo; and in general these functional heroes with adjectival names are by no means the amorphous characters to which Dr. Usener's definition of a *Sondergott* would be applicable, while rigid specialisation of function is not necessarily a mark of primitive religion but belongs also to advanced polytheism.

The paper was a sketch of the last chapter of the writer's forthcoming fourth volume of 'Cults of the Greek states.'

LEWIS R. FARNELL.
Hon. Sec.

VERSION.

A WOOING SONG OF A YEOMAN OF KENT'S SON.

I have house and land in Kent
And if you'll love me, love me now ;
Twopence-halfpenny is my rent,
And I cannot come every day to woo.

CHORUS. *Twopence-halfpenny is his rent,
And he cannot come every day to woo.*

Ich am my vather's eldest zonne,
My mother eke doth love me well,
For ich can bravely clout my shoone,
And ich full well can ring a bell.

My vather he gave me a hog,
My mother she gave me a sow ;
I have a God-vather dwells thereby,
And he on me bestowed a plow.

One time I gave thee a paper of pins,
Another time a tawdry-lace ;
And if thou wilt not grant me love,
In truth ich die bevore thy face.

Ich have been twice our Whitson-lord,
Ich have had ladies many vair,
And eke thou hast my heart in hold
And in my mind seems passing rare.

Ich will put on my best white slops
And ich will wear my yellow hose,
And on my head a good grey hat,
And in't ich stick a lovely rose.

Wherefore cease off, make no delay,
And if you'll love me, love me now,
Or else ich seek some oderwhere,
For I cannot come every day to woo.

1611

Ἀγροίκος μνηστῆρων.

Οἶκον ἔχω καὶ ἀγρὸν Βοιωτίων, ἐνθεν ἔτειος
τρῆς ὀβολοὶ πρόσθοδος· τὸ δὲ νῦν φίλει εἰ
με φιλησείς,
μναστῆσων γὰρ ἐκάστω ἐπ' ἄματος οὐ κα
ἰκοίμαν.

Πρεσβύτατος τῷ πατρὶ γόνῳ γέγον', ἃ δὲ με
μάτηρ
ἐκ κραδίας πεφίλακ', εὖ μὲν κωδωνοκροτεῦντα,
εὖ δ' ἔτι καὶ κρηπιδας ἐπιστάμενον καταράπτειν.

Ἄρσενα πρὶν μὲν ἔδωκε πατὴρ ἵα, νῦν δὲ
φίλα μοι
μάτηρ καὶ θήλειαν ἐπάγαγεν· ἔστι δὲ πάτρως
ἀγχόθι πα ναίων· ὃ δὲ μοι καὶ ἄροτρον ἔδωκεν.

Μέμνασ' ὥς ποκὰ μὲν περόνας ποκὰ δ' ἔργον
ἵφαντ' ἄν
ἐξ ἀγορᾶς ἀσκητὸν ἔδωκά τοι· αἱ δὲ κ' ἀναίγη,
αὐτίκα τὰν ψυχὰν καὶ ἐν ὄμμασιν ἐνθάδ' ἀφησῶ.

Ἦδη πομπεύειν τὰ Θαλύσιά μ' εἴλετο κῶμα
δὶς ποκὰ, καὶ πολλαῖσιν ἄδον κάλλαισι γυναιξίν,
ἐκ τεύδ' ἤρτημαι, τὸ δ' ἐμὰ γυνάμη τι περισσόν.

Καὶ μὰν τὰν βαιτᾶν ἐνδύσομαι ἅτις ἀρίστα
καρβατίνας τ' ἐπὶ τῇ τὰς φερτάτας· ἐντὶ δὲ πυρραῖ
καὶ στέφανον κομψῶς ῥόδινον περὶ κρατὶ φορησῶ.

Πρὸς τὰδε μοι φράζευ, καὶ μὴ τριβάς, εἰ δὲ
φιλησείς
νῦν φίλει, ἢ ζητησῶ ἀπ' ἄλλοθεν, οὐ γὰρ
ἐκάστω
μναστῆσωνθ', ὥς εἶπον, ἐπ' ἄματος οἶά θ' ἰκέσθαι.

W. H.

ARCHAEOLOGY

THE HUNTERIAN COIN-CATALOGUE.

*Catalogue of Greek Coins in the Hunterian
Collection, University of Glasgow.* Vol. II.
By GEO. MACDONALD. £3 3s.

THE second volume of this stately work has appeared at an interval of but two years and a half after the first. One does not know which to admire more, the rapidity with which the author works, or the unselfish devotion with which he dedicates his

scanty leisure to the task of making Hunter's treasures more accessible to scholars than they have hitherto been in Charles Combe's remarkable, but now obsolete catalogue. Only those who have made catalogues can realise the amount of work involved in a compilation of this kind. If the catalogue is carefully written, what gets into print represents about a tenth part of the time spent in comparison and combination of the material available in other

collections. The scientific catalogue contains nothing but the essence distilled from such material, and the rigid exclusion of extraneous matter, with the increasingly elaborate specialisation of numismatic study, gives the whole product a stern and unattractive appearance. Probably many archaeologists believe that when numismatists meet in secret, their toast—a modification of that generally ascribed to mathematicians—is: "The Higher Numismatics, and may they never be of any use to anybody." Without sacrificing scientific accuracy of description, Mr. Macdonald has been less uncompromising, and, as in his first volume, relieves the text of his catalogue with brief notes, which serve to give the reader his bearings, and especially to call attention to the more recent periodical literature. For beginners in numismatics, these two volumes, with their sixty-two photographic plates, are already recognized as an invaluable training-ground. The Hunter Collection is sufficiently small to be manageable by the beginner, and is nevertheless very fairly representative. Gaps of course there are. It is curious to see the Cyzicene electrum represented by one stater and one sixth. The collection is poor in Asiatic electrum generally; of the coins generally attributed to the time of Croesus there is a single specimen in silver; Amyntas of Galatia is represented by bronze alone; and the series of Elis and Argos are comparatively weak. Nevertheless these gaps have their interest, as shewing what series, now well known, were in Hunter's time less common or completely hidden in the earth, and as holding forth a promise of future discoveries. In one respect, the collection is surprisingly modern, and inspires great respect for Hunter's good sense: the coinage of the Greek cities under the Empire is very fully represented. These coins are not beautiful, but in other respects are often of much greater importance than the autonomous issues. By collectors as a rule they are neglected because they make no display, and generally are an unprofitable investment from the pecuniary point of view. Hunter was perhaps the first among the short series of honourable exceptions to the rule—exceptions such as Leake, Borrell, Banbury, and, among living Englishmen, Sir Hermann Weber.

This is hardly the place to enter into matters of detail, even if there were many criticisms to make. Mr. Macdonald mentions, but prudently refrains from accepting, Lermann's theory that the Athenian tetra-

drachms with three olive-leaves in Athena's helmet begin as late as 480 B.C. On No. 33 of Athens, as he says, an argument might be based for the continuation of the tetradrachm issues during the time of Philip and Alexander; if the coin did not appear to be possibly of Eastern origin. To judge from the plate, the latter alternative seems highly probable. The same is true of Nos. 48 and 49. The symbol on the latter recalls a symbol on some strange coins with Tarsian types (B.M.C. *Lycaonia* etc. Pl. xxxii. 5, 6), which were certainly not struck at Tarsus, and are probably of Phoenician origin. No. 133 of Corinth represents the familiar conical erection within an enclosure. The cataloguer refers to Imhoof-Blumer and Gardner's suggestion that the type may represent an obelisk within a stadium. An unpublished (!) coin of Caesarea Germanica tends to confirm this explanation, for it shews an obelisk underneath a large circular enclosure containing seated spectators. The proportions of the two parts of the type are of course very different on the two coins; but this is a matter in which the die-engravers of the time shewed deplorable laxity. The present volume (in which the plates are noticeably better than in its predecessor), contains the coins of the whole of North-Western and Central Greece, Peloponnesus, the Islands, and Asia Minor with Cyprus. The next and concluding volume should be of the highest interest, for it will include the splendid series of Seleucid coins, for which Hunter's Cabinet has always been famous; and there is every hope that Mr. Macdonald's researches will set at rest some of the vexed questions which make that series only less bewildering than the Parthians and Ptolemies. We have spoken of the third volume as the concluding one; but it is with the pious hope that someone will be found to emulate Mr. Stevenson's noble example, and that Mr. Macdonald may find time—the inclination we know he already possesses—to do for the magnificent Roman series what he has done for the Greek.

G. F. HILL.

MONTHLY RECORD.

ITALY.

Turin.—On the site of the Roman city, during a reconstruction of the present quarter, a well or pit came to light, which had been filled up with rubbish of various kinds (fragments of marble, stucco, glass, pottery, and tiles), and animals' bones, all being of the Roman period and apparently of one date. Into

this well had been thrown the head of a bronze statue, the rest of which was not found, also a marble torso of Cupid bending his bow. The head, which had been gilded, represents a young man, and from the likeness of the features to the coins of Augustus and the Prima Porta statue of that Emperor, it probably may be identified as his portrait.¹

Chiusei.—Two remarkable Etruscan busts in bronze have come to light, and are now in the Museum at Florence. One is male, with pronounced features and a beard indicated by incisions as on black-figured vases; the hair is long and covered with a sort of cap, and the chest is covered with scales, which may indicate a fish-body, such as Triton is represented with, or on the other hand a cuirass or aegis. On the top of the head is a ring which has been attached to some iron object. The bust is hollow and the inner surface has been strengthened with lead; it has been mounted on wood and seems to have been used for carrying about in processions. The other is similar in type but inferior in style; it represents a goddess with necklaces and hair falling in plaits on the shoulders; presumably a feminine counterpart of the other, in which Sig. Milani sees a marine Zeus. But it is more probably a Triton type. The date of the busts is about 600 B.C.²

Rome.—Some light has been thrown on the history of the temple of Castor and Pollux by the clearing away of the rubbish at the back. Some large blocks of marble were found, which serve to explain the problem of its early destruction, all bearing traces of damage of different nature and period. It seems probable that the temple fell in an earthquake in the year 502, and its remains were subsequently further damaged when the marble attracted notice for building purposes.

Under the platform of the temple of Venus and Rome the pavement of the older Via Sacra has been discovered. In regard to this a question has arisen whether the arch of Titus, which is thirty-five feet to the west, was erected by Domitian on the older route and removed by Hadrian when he altered its course for his new temple of Venus and Rome, or whether the route had already been altered by Nero. Further researches, which are still in progress, may give additional information.³

Pompeii.—In September 1901, a marble bas-relief was found representing a sacrifice of a ram to Aphrodite, probably from a fourth-century original. She is seated on a rock with lotos-sceptre and approached by six persons, of whom two are children, and the foremost leads the ram. Among other finds were a *giallo antico* head of a Maenad from a terminal figure, wearing an ivy-wreath, and numerous terra-cottas, one representing a draped woman of considerable merit.⁴ During October a long list of finds were

made, but nothing was discovered worthy of special mention; they include forty-five gold Imperial coins from Augustus to Domitian, over 1,000 bronze coins of the same period, and 795 silver coins, both Republican and Imperial, but mostly in bad condition.⁴

Sorrento.—An interesting inscription has been found which runs as follows: IMP · TITVS · CAESAR · DIVI · VESPASIANI · F · VESPASII · AVG · PONT · MAX · TR · POT · [IX · IMP · XV | COS · IIX · CENSOR · P · P · HOROLOG · IVM · CVM · SVIS | ORNAMENTIS · TERRAE · MOTI · BVVS CONLAPSVM · REST. The restorations are all certain. The earthquakes alluded to were either those which so seriously damaged Pompeii in the reign of Nero or else those which, as the younger Pliny tells us, accompanied the eruption of Vesuvius in A.D. 79. The date of the inscription is A.D. 80. Other restorations undertaken by Titus at this time and in this district are referred to in *C.I.L.* x. 1481 (=Kaibel, *Inscr. Gr. Sic. u. Ital.* 729); and in *C.I.L.* x. 1617 there is another allusion to a *horologium*.⁵

SICILY.

Syracuse.—Two marble statues have been found in the city, one of Hades or Pluto with Cerberus at his side; the type is also known for Sarapis, but in this case the Chthonian head-dress is absent. The other is of Hygieia, with a serpent twisted round her right arm; the head is wanting. Both are of the Hellenistic age.⁶

Centorbi.—A singular discovery has recently been made of a long leaden coffin containing the skeleton of a boy who has evidently suffered from the disease known as rachitis. He wears a bronze armband, and in the mouth was a coin of Hiero II. as *ραδάριον* or Charon's fare. Above the skull was a terra-cotta medallion with a bust of Artemis, the head projecting in the round, a type not uncommon in Sicilian terra-cottas (cf. D 3 in Brit. Mus.). She was often regarded as the protectress of boys, as in the case of Sparta, where Artemis Korythallia was worshipped.⁷

GREECE.

Tegea.—The French School has discovered, on the site of the temple of Athena Alea, fragments of the pediment-sculptures representing the Calydonian boar-hunt (Paus. viii. 45, 6); they include the torso of Atalanta, a head of Herakles, and part of a hound; also the head of Hygieia from the statue in the temple (*ibid.* 47, 1), and small early bronzes of the types found at Olympia and the Argive Heraion. Excavations will be continued in the stadium and in the Temple of Athena Polias.⁸

H. B. WALTERS.

¹ *Notizie degli Scavi*, Sept. 1901.² *Notizie degli Scavi*, July 1901.³ *Athenaeum*, 5 April 1902.⁴ *Notizie degli Scavi*, Oct. 1901.⁵ *Notizie degli Scavi*, Aug. 1901.⁶ *Athenaeum*, 25 Jan. 1902.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

American Journal of Philology. Vol. xxii, 3. Whole No. 87. 1901.

A further collection of *Latin Proverbs*, M. C. Sutphen. On the association of Numerals, H. Oertel. The Bodleian fragments of Juvenal, H. L. Wilson. On the form of Horace's Lesser Asclepiads, L. J. Richardson. The unreal conditional sentence in Plautus, H. C. Nutting. A note on the Achaemenian Inscription, T. Michelson. Notes on the Septuagint text of *II. Sam.*, J. W. Rice. There are reviews of Schulze's *Römische Elegiker* (K. F. Smith), Seaton's Oxford text of *Apollonius Rhodius* (E. Fitch) and Henry's *Lexique Étymologique des termes les plus usuels du Breton Moderne* (O. B. Schlutter).

Mnemosyne. Vol. 30, 2. 1902.

Ad *Thucydides*, H. v. Herwerden. Notes on books v-viii with reference to Hude's edition. *De Hegione in Terentii Adelphis*, G. E. W. v. Hille. Terence, by keeping untouched the customs regarding the condition of heiresses and at the same time making Hegio the *proximus cognatus* of Simulus, has spoilt the Greek original. *Ad Eur. Hipp.* 43-46, M. L. Earle. Takes away the comma at end of l. 45. *Observationes criticae ad Dionysii Halicarnassensis Antiquitates Romanae*, S. A. Naber. *Ad Plutarchum*, J. J. H. On Lyc. 11. *Homerica*, H. v. Herwerden. Critical notes on the *Iliad* with reference to van Leeuwen and da Costa's second ed. *Ad Plutarchum*, J. J. H. On Lyc. 21. *Observationes criticae ad iure Romano*, J. C. Naber. 'Ad noxales actiones.' *Ad Plutarchum*, J. J. H. On Fab. Max. 13. *Homerica*, J. v. Leeuwen. On the preface of Aristonice's *περί ομηέων* with reference to Sijthoff's publication of Cod. Venetus A in phototype. *Tacitea*, J. J. Hartman. Various notes. *Ad Plutarchum*, J. J. H. On Num. 3. *Ad Aristophanis Plutum*, J. v. Leeuwen. Critical notes.

Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik. Vol. xii, 3. 1901.

Analogiebildungen auf -ellus, -ella, -ellum, E. Wölfflin. *Zu Caecilii Aurelianus Actuarum passionum libri III.*, G. Helmreich. Critical notes. *Animae-guitardare*, E. Nestle. = *μακροθυμειν* e.g. Eccli. 29, 11. *Lucania*, E. Wölfflin. Maintains the text *Lucani* in *Cic. Tusc.* i § 89. *Lucania* perhaps does not occur before Horace (*Sat.* ii. 1. 38). *Építome*, E. Wölfflin. On the meaning of this word and its distinction from *Periocha*. *Plinius und Cluvius Rufus*, E. Wölfflin. Rejects Cluvius Rufus as a supposed common source of Tacitus and Plutarch. *Titulus Munimianus*, E. Wölfflin. Restores the metre of this inscr. by the omission of the word *imperator*. *Zur Geschichte der Pronomina demonstrativa III*, Meader-Wölfflin. On *iste* and *ipse*. *Zur lateinischen Wortbildung*, A. Zimmermann. On *opter*=*propter*, *Albanus* *Λευκός*, *Stolus*, *Indolis* *ἐπίτοπος*, *Commoram*, *Tellor*=*homo*, *Necessis*. *Agnellus*, *agellus*, *salsamentarius*, E. Wölfflin. *Die Bildungen auf -enus*, R. Planta. *Moderne Lexikographie*, E. Wölfflin. It is not the amount of knowledge that is of importance so much as the standpoint. We must look not at single authors but

at Latinity as a whole. *Similitudinariae, infrugifer, ancio*, J. E. B. Mayor. References given for these words. *Zur Mulomedicina Chironis I*, E. Lommatsch. *Bruta, Oruia, Glos, glutit, gluma*, G. Gundermann. *De Interjektion en. Enim, nempe*, J. M. Stowasser. *Das Suffix-aster. Propitius, Kompar. propior, E. Wölfflin. Salus, K. Brugmann. Ipse etiam. Domo. Latro, F. Vogel. Bubia. Carrus, Sternbild des Bären, Ov. Densusianu.*

Part 4.

Zur Latinität der Epitome Caesarum, E. Wölfflin. As Aurelius Victor wrote his *Caesares* in 360 A.D. the composition of this epitome is at least a generation later. *Matrem gerere. Agricola=agricolas*, E. Wölfflin. *Über das Alter der Martial-Lemmata in den Handschriften der Familie B*, G. Landgraf. These MSS. go back to a recension by Torquatus Gennadius in 401 A.D. The Lemmata in the MSS. are either by G. himself or by some assistant of his. *Ereus*, H. Möller. *Die Hegesippus-Frage*, G. Landgraf. From a comparison of language maintains the old opinion that Ambrosius is the author of the Latin translation of Josephus going under the name of Hegesippus. *Zur Geschichte der Pronomina demonstrativa IV.*, E. Wölfflin. *Oricula. Anasus*, P. Wesner. *Os umerosque deo similis*, E. Wölfflin. *Studien zum poetischen Plural bei den Römern*, P. Maas. (1) Generally, (2) Giving a notion of mass, (3) Parts of the body. *Zur Mulomedicina Chironis II.*, E. Lommatsch. *Über, ubera*, E. Wölfflin. *Fovea=fovea*, J. Cornu. *Die Epitome des Julius Exuperantius*, C. Weyman and G. Landgraf. The text with notes. Composed fourth or fifth century A.D. *Ab und Caitho*, E. Lattes. From an Etruscan inscription. *Abaso*, of M. Stowasser. *Abaso* is a miswriting for *agaso*. *Decrator, δεξιολάβος*, E. Nestle. *Biduom und Triduom*, F. Sommer. In Plautus the *i* in these words is long, which has not yet been explained. *Zur Bildung der lateinischen Personennamen*. A. Zimmermann.

Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie. 1902.

26 March. E. L. Hicks and G. F. Hill, *A manual of Greek historical inscriptions*. New ed. (W. Laufeld), very favourable. G. Showermann, *The Great Mother of the Gods* (H. Stending). 'A very useful work, rich in material.' R. Kobert, *Welche dem Menschen gefährlichen Spinnen konnten die Alten?* (Fuchs) K. Breysig, *Kulturgeschichte der Neuzeit, II. Altertum und Mittelalter als Vorstufen der Neuzeit, I. Hälfte* (F. Cauer). 'Everywhere notions take the place of living reality.'

2 April. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri II*, ed. by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt (O. Schulthess), very favourable. Tacitus, *Germania*, von H. Schweizer-Sidler. 6. A. von E. Schwyzler (U. Zernial), very favourable. K. Krumbacher, *Romanos und Kyriakos* (G. Wartenberg), favourable. H. Müller, *Fort mit den Schulprogrammen!* (O. Weissenfels).

9 April. Th. Zielinski, *Die Behandlung gleichzeitiger Ereignisse im antiken Epos. I.* (Hoerenz), favourable. L. Mitteis, *Aus den griechischen Papyrusurkunden* (O. Schulthess), very favourable. M. C. P. Schmidt, *Realistische Chrestomatie aus der Lit-*

teratur des Klassischen Altertums. III. (F. Harder), very favourable.

16 April. *Paulys Realencyklopädie der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, herausg. von G. Wissowa. 8. Halbband (F. Harder) Σ. Ἀρβανιτοπούλλου Ζητήματα τοῦ Ἀπτικοῦ δικαίου. II. (O. Schulthess), favourable.

J. de Heyden-Zielewicz, *Prolegomena in Pseudocelli de universi natura libellum* (K. Praechter), unfavourable.

23 April. G. Rizzo, *Le tavole finanziarie di Taormina* (O. Schulthess), favourable. Σ. Σταυρίδης. Περί τῆς νοθεύσεως τοῦ Θεουκυδίδου (Widmann).

ADDENDUM (p. 194).—Mr. Kenyon, comparing a papyrus, in a hand very similar to that of the Alcaeus fragment, published by Comparetti in the Gomperz Festschrift, which has on its verso a document of the third century and so can hardly itself be older than the second century, is of opinion that Dr. Schubart's date is too early.

The editor takes this opportunity of asking the readers of the *C.R.* to correct the following misprints in names of modern Greek writers in the March issue which escaped detection owing to the disadvantages under which the proof was corrected.

Page 98, col. 2 near the top. For 'Polemas' read 'Palamas,' for 'Mashoras' read 'Markoras,' and for 'Karkobitsas' read 'Karkavitsas.'